Youth Engagement with Anzac in New Zealand: A Christchurch Case Study

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the

Degree of Master of Arts in Sociology

Alice Ansley

University of Canterbury

2018

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Acknowledgements and Dedication

To the students I interviewed, thank you for giving up your time and sharing your classroom experiences with me. Your discussions and perspectives enriched my understanding of contemporary Anzac and I feel privileged to be the one to represent your unique ideas.

To my friends and family, thank you for always being interested in my progress and ideas even if it was tedious for you at times. You always asked the right questions, understood the space I needed to have and provided wine or helpful resources, depending on my headspace at the time. You are some of the most inspiring people I know and I am so lucky to have you all in my life.

I would like to especially acknowledge my supervisors, Dr Lyndon Fraser and Dr Karyn Stewart, who were there with me every step of the way. Their combined academic knowledge blew me away and challenged me to develop my ideas on a deeper level. They supported my ever-changing ideas and my own personal style of writing and time management. This support enabled me to feel excited about my thesis, rather than daunted by it. Thank you for the coffees, the cups of Earl Grey tea and the encouragement right up to the very end.

Lastly, I would like to acknowledge and dedicate this thesis to my parents, Cath and Chris Ansley. They taught me the meaning of hard work, the importance of developing my own opinions and views of the world and the necessity for a balanced lifestyle. When stress and self-doubt crept in during this thesis writing process, they reminded me of these lessons and encouraged me to keep striving to reach my goals. You two are the dream team. Thank you for the endless support, occasional pep talks, the hugs, the kisses and the gin and tonics. I hope I have done you proud.

Abstract

This thesis explores the discussions and perspectives of Christchurch secondary school students in regards to their particular experiences and engagement with Anzac. In this thesis I seek to rigorously and robustly examine these viewpoints through semi-structured focus group interviews and thematic analysis. I seek to situate these youth perspectives within wider debates around Anzac mythology and Anzac resurgence in New Zealand which often do not represent the youth outlook. These debates are seen, on the one hand, to present a resurgence of youth engagement with Anzac and, on the other hand, to present the idea that Anzac has become an exclusionary myth which distorts Australians' and New Zealanders' understanding of wider Anzac experiences and educates them in a narrow, militarised way.

Youth engagement with Anzac was not something which could be solely situated under either of these debates and, instead, it was seen to be multifaceted and made up of unique ideas and elements. The youth in my study acknowledged that their Anzac education did have mythic elements which made it hard for them to engage with Anzac despite the fact that they were actually interested in learning and understanding it. These mythic elements were the idea that Anzac is taught as a 'simple narrative' which does not allow room for critique, that it emphasises a link between Anzac and national identity, that it disregards many alternative Anzac experiences and that it presents a particular New Zealand identity to internalise. These students responded to their mythic Anzac education in a very active way, and instead of accepting it as truth, they were able to have constructive and critical conversations about their education and push against parts of it which they found to be too narrow or skewed in particular directions based on gender, ethnicity and national identity.

The students were not passive vessels which internalised their Anzac education as fact; instead, they were able to acknowledge the mythic elements of their education and its negative influence in the

classroom. This thesis went further in exploring what factors were seen to enhance this active process of critique and provide students with alternative knowledge and perspectives about Anzac. These factors were ancestral ties to Anzac, research into personal Anzac stories and experiences, unassessed educational units, centenary discussions, an understanding of hardship through the earthquakes and alternative perspectives of the Anzac experience through access to the internet. These factors presented a broader understanding of Anzac perspectives and experiences and students believed that if the mythic elements of their education could be revised and these elements encouraged then their engagement with Anzac would continue long into the future.

Chapter 1: A Contextualisation: Anzac Resurgence, Anzac Mythology and Youth in Christchurch

Introduction

The aim of this thesis is to collect, engage with and accurately present the voices and perspectives of Christchurch youth in regard to their particular experiences and engagement with Anzac. This exploratory thesis seeks to understand how the Anzac experience is framed, taught and internalised by youth and whether they seek to comply with or challenge this aspect of our New Zealand history. This thesis will seek to position youth perspectives within wider debates and literature around Anzac resurgence and Anzac mythology. These debates are seen, on the one hand, to present a resurgence of youth engagement with Anzac and, on the other hand, to present the idea that Anzac has become an exclusionary myth which distorts Australians' and New Zealanders' understanding of wider Anzac experiences and educates them in a narrow, militarised way. These debates are seen to be missing youth perspectives and are seen to merely assume what youth engagement and education is occurring. I seek to fill this gap by engaging with youth in a controlled academic setting and giving them space to respond to these assumptions about their engagement and education. The only way to critique or add to the claims of resurgence and myth-making was to go to youth directly and seek to situate their perspectives within the debate.

37 Christchurch secondary school students from seven different schools took part in semi-structured focus group interviews which gave them room to navigate their position within debates around Anzac engagement and Anzac education in New Zealand. The students presented key elements of their Anzac education which they highlighted as distorting their understanding of Anzac which were the idea that it is taught as a 'simple narrative' which does not allow room for critique, that it emphasises a link between Anzac and national identity, that it disregards many alternative Anzac

experiences and that it presents a particular New Zealander identity to internalise. This thesis argues that these distorting elements suggest that Anzac has indeed become a myth which distorts youth understanding of wider Anzac experiences and educates them in a narrow, militarised way. Elements of this myth in their education were seen to make it hard for them to engage with Anzac despite the fact that many of them were actually interested in learning and understanding it.

It is the students' response to the presence of the myth in their education which this thesis argues is of particular interest. The students by no means passively accepted and internalised their mythic Anzac education as truth. The students were instead seen to be active agents in their own engagement and learning of Anzac, in that they were able to recognise the elements of their Anzac education which were mythic, narrow and distorted, push against them and question what it was about these elements that they did not agree with or could not align themselves with. This active process of critique allowed the students to hold on to their interest in the Anzac experience.

This thesis goes further and examines the factors which were seen to enhance this active process of critique. The students were armed with knowledge and tools to critique the Anzac myth and actively respond to the ways it was seen to limit their understanding of Anzac in the classroom and this thesis suggests six factors which enhanced this process. These factors are ancestral ties to Anzac, research into personal Anzac stories and experiences, unassessed educational units, centenary discussions, an understanding of hardship through the earthquakes and alternative perspectives of the Anzac experience through access to the internet. These factors enabled the students to push against the mythic elements of their education because they presented a broader understanding of Anzac perspectives and experiences which the students could use as comparisons in the classroom. These factors enhanced student engagement with Anzac and encouraged the continuance of active critique.

This discussion now moves to the first section of this thesis which seeks to contextualise the key debates around Christchurch youth engagement with Anzac. These debates are seen, on the one

hand, to present a resurgence of youth engagement with Anzac and, on the other hand, to present the idea that Anzac has become an exclusionary myth which distorts Australians' and New Zealanders' understanding of wider Anzac experiences and educates them in a narrow, militarised way. This section presents a gap in the literature which I discovered and sought to fill with my collected student discussions and perspectives.

Resurgence in Youth Engagement with Anzac

The idea for this thesis was prompted by the 2015 centenary of the Anzac landing in Gallipoli and the 2016 centenary of the first Anzac day commemoration in New Zealand. These anniversaries sparked considerable discussion amongst peers and within the media around what Anzac now means to people in the 21st century. Discussions raised were around its level of importance to our national identity and its continued place in our New Zealand curriculum. There was speculation around how the younger generations were inheriting these Anzac traditions through the curriculum and how their involvement would set the stage for Anzac in the future. Two key debates were identified within this Anzac discussion, one being that there was an apparent resurgence in youth engagement with Anzac and, the other, the argument that Anzac has become an exclusionary myth which distorts Australians' and New Zealanders' understanding of wider Anzac experiences and educates them in a narrow, militarised way. New Zealand media was emphasising an increased youth presence in Anzac commemorations around the country and along with this, Australian literature, some based on interviews with youth, was arguing the way we are learning and understanding Anzac is a distortion of the actual reality. When looking to the New Zealand literature to make sense of two debates, I was presented with a significant gap. The literature did not talk to youth about their engagement with Anzac and was not giving them a chance to discuss their perspectives, unlike what was occurring in some of the Australian literature. Their engagement was instead either generalised or

assumed on their behalf within the media, or lacking altogether. This thesis seeks to fill this gap and give youth in New Zealand a voice on the Anzac topic. It seeks to give them room to respond to these debates and situate themselves within Anzac discussions in New Zealand.

'Anzac' or 'Anzacs' as a term in this thesis incorporates all the people that were a part of New Zealand's and Australia's involvement in World War One and the traditions and commemorations that surround it. 'Anzac' is used in lowercase to encompass these things, rather than the uppercase 'ANZAC' which is usually used when referring only to the specific Australia and New Zealand Military Corps (New Zealand Ministry for Culture and Heritage, 2017 & New Zealand Returned Services Association, 2017). This follows common usage in each piece of the reviewed literature as well as the designation of 25 April as 'Anzac' Day. This chapter will now seek to further explain these two debates and present the Australian literature which helped inspire this thesis.

An apparent resurgence in New Zealand youth engagement with Anzac was a key debate which was identified within discussions around Anzac. This debate was brought to my attention during my preliminary research around Anzac and a small comment on the Ministry for Culture and Heritage (2017) website which claimed that Anzac has undergone a renaissance since the 80s with more and more young people attending the services. I sought further understanding of this claim in academic literature and I was presented with a gap and lack of information seeking to unpack this claim. I then looked to the media via online library catalogues and chose a random sample of one newspaper per the 16 regions in New Zealand, which included national newspapers reporting on a certain region. I used the key words Anzac, youth, young people, teenagers, students, schoolchildren, next generation and younger generation and searched each newspaper for evidence of this claim within the past five years. What I found was that 14 out of the 16 newspapers reported on the increasing presence of youth at Anzac events. For example, Auckland Mayor, Len Brown, said of the 2014 Auckland Anzac Day ceremonies that he was seeing young people take a lead role and "carrying the baton and taking the spirit of Anzac forward" (Harcourt, 2014). Similarly, Malcolm Cox, Principal of

Raglan Area School, said he saw more young people than ever attending local services which coincides with “a vastly increased interest by younger people around the country in the Anzac tradition” (Symes, 2017). The Nelson Returned Services Association also reported the need to arrive early to the 2016 commemoration in Anzac Park because of young people’s increased interest in commemoration. This was said to follow a New Zealand-wide trend buoyed after the centenary of the Gallipoli landing (Long, 2016). Locally, Christchurch Mayor, Lianne Dalziel, also pointed out the “pleasing presence of an increasing number of young people getting involved in the Christchurch ceremonies” (Cannet, 2016).

These were just a small sample of the New Zealand media examples which represented the recurring idea that youth engagement with Anzac is increasing. What was interesting was that these discussions were not being based on discussion with youth but mere speculation. The articles were assuming and generalising the youth perspective without actually seeking to understand or accurately present their ideas. The articles were often merely pointing out the presence of young people in the crowd, guessing as to whether this was more than last year and then concluding this must mean there has been increase in interest. However, as Robinson (2010, as cited in McKay, 2013) argued, it is ‘not just a matter of attendance’ but ‘a question of attitude.’ Participation in or turning up to Anzac commemorations does not necessarily mean youth are engaging with Anzac traditions and customs. By engagement, I mean are they actually asking questions of what they see and what they take part in? Does their education allow them to critically engage with this aspect of our war history? What factors are allowing or hindering this engagement? I realised that to accurately and rigorously answer these questions, there needed to be more than media speculation. There needed to be a formal academic discussion.

Anzac as a Sacred Myth

Australian literature helped to inspire my academic study of New Zealand youth and also presented the other major debate around Anzac that the way Australians and New Zealanders are learning and understanding Anzac is a distortion of the actual reality. Clarke (2008) conducted a study which looked at historical engagement within the Australian history curriculum. This study was based on interviews with a large, diverse range of youth in Australia and outlined the importance of giving youth a voice on the Anzac topic; "it's all too easy to think students don't know what's good for them but they actually have serious things to say about Australian history which deserves to be listened to" (Clarke, 2008, p141). Clarke (2008, p19) highlighted that debates around how Anzac is taught and presented in Australia lack substance without the viewpoint of youth; "we probably all have ideas on what kids should know, but do we really have a sense of what they think?" It was argued that perspectives around historical understanding and engagement cannot be assumed but need to be understood within a safe academic setting. This upheld my goal of filling such a gap in New Zealand and seeking the youth perspective on Anzac within the academic environment of my thesis.

A significant finding within the Clarke (2008) study was the idea that the Anzac experience has been transformed into a sacred myth or distortion of reality which prompts admiration not analysis of the Anzac experience within the classroom. This introduced me to Australian literature presenting this debate which argued that Anzac has become an exclusionary myth which distorts Australians' and New Zealanders' understanding of wider Anzac experiences and educates them in a narrow, militarised way. The myth was seen to be a "conservative nationalist memory of war" based on a narrow and exclusionary representation of the Anzac experience (McDonald, 2009, p11). It was seen to not allow for alternative memories or interpretations of history which should also hold a valid place in public perception but which lose out to this dominant myth. Clarke (2008) found that the

Anzac experience, as it is taught to youth, distorts a proper understanding of Gallipoli and marginalises other accounts of the formation of national values, social, civic and political traditions and different Australians' experiences. Anzac was just one aspect of Clarke's study, so there was minimal discussion and expansion of this debate based on youth perspectives. However, this study did introduce me to a collection of Australian literature which expanded upon this critical view of Anzac understanding and education. I wanted to know where New Zealand youth felt they sat within this debate and whether they indeed experience or acknowledge a distortion of their engagement with Anzac because of this idea of Anzac becoming a 'myth'. I will now thoroughly examine this debate and set a context within which I can position the youth perspectives I collected.

Mythology: What it is and How it Works

Roland Barthes in his 1993 book 'Mythologies' outlines myth as a type of speech or a system of communication which can consist of modes of writing or of representations. Barthes (1993, p109) outlines that it is "not only written discourse but also photography, cinema, reporting, sport, shows, publicity which can serve as a support to mythical speech." He understands myth as a semiological system which draws on Ferdinand de Saussure's study of semiology and the idea that facts are endowed with significance. Within this theory, it is the association between the signifier and the signified which creates a signification, or a myth. Simply put, the signifier expresses the signified which creates a myth which is consumed as fact. The signified can have many signifiers and it is this repetition of the myth, through different forms, which builds up a collective understanding of something such as the world of wrestling, as one of Barthes' examples, or Anzac, in the case of this debate.

The function of this system of mythology is to distort, not to make disappear - where the "fact becomes a token of something else" (Barthes, 1993, p111). Semiology, as argued by Barthes, has the power to exclude alternative rationalities by using particular, selected signifiers to create a

signification. This can deprive something like Anzac of particular interpretations of history or the past because it presents only a distortion of the 'truth', which becomes unquestioned in terms of where it came from or why it was normalised. This is because myth is made up of "material which has already been worked on so as to make suitable for communication" and it presupposes a signifying consciousness (Barthes, 1993, p151). It becomes hard for society to ignore the particular meaning the myth is trying to convey, let alone question what is being left out. As Schopflin (1997) outlines, myth becomes a management of meanings or a socially constituted form of communication by which culture is transmitted, received and remembered.

The symbolic value produced by this system of mythology is particularly important. Fulbrook (1997) outlines that myths gain momentum and influence because they produce symbolic power which is constantly reproduced and re-enacted. Symbols are thus the building blocks of myth because it is these re-enacted symbolic expressions which represent the important values to be internalised by the public or which shape themselves in the human psyche (Schopflin, 1997 & Panneerselvam, 1999). Symbols and mythology greatly influence the human psyche in this way and work on what Carl Jung coined the 'collective unconscious'. This concept relates to the deepest layers of the shared structures of the unconscious mind and the similar ways of being and doing that people have. It derives from the indirect examination of particular influences, repeated images, mythological motifs, symbols and behaviours (Jung 1960 & 1970). The collective unconscious and mythology are strongly intertwined and exert influence over each other which, in turn, exerts influence on the minds of the individuals. This concept is important to outline because as Kevin Rudd argued, "Gallipoli is part of our national consciousness, it is part of our national psyche, it is part of our national identity" and it plays a central role in Australians' and New Zealanders' collective identity (cited in Damousi, 2010, p94). A discussion of how the Anzac myth influences individuals in this way will now follow.

The Concept of Collective Forgetting

Anzac mythology can be understood as a highly selective means of collective forgetting and exclusion which seeks to present a particular understanding of Anzac to the Australian and New Zealand populations. Also coined social amnesia by Jacoby (1975), this concept sees a collective forgetting by a social group because of a repression of memories and a re-imagining of ideas and histories. Schopflin (1997, p26) outlines that mythology often plays such a role in "the maintenance of memory, the range of forgetting, which part of memory is made salient, how it is understood and how the resonance itself is to be controlled." It is about regulating the past through myth by excluding and re-imagining events in the public unconsciousness.

Smith (1997) outlines that this process is orchestrated by intellectual elites in the hope of creating, what he calls, a usable past. The argument here is that nations need particular myths, made up of dominant memories and interpretations of the past, so as to serve the interests of those in power. As such, elites are argued to use selected aspects of the past, to invent traditions and to tailor national myths in order to manipulate mass emotion and to control mass mobilisation. Smith (1997) outlines that a useable past has to be developed in an extensive way so that it can live in popular memory and can be recovered through artefacts, records and oral transmission.

One major argument, outlined by George Schopflin, is that the myth is employed by elites as a device for withstanding and dealing with the difficult reality of war, linked to the idea of a usable past as outlined by Smith (1997) above. It allows for only a positive memory of the campaign. Panneerselvam (1999, p23) outlines this idea as having basis in Levi-Strauss and the idea that myth "has a function of reconciling on the imaginary plane those social contradictions which cannot be resolved on the real plane." Myths, for him, were seen as therapeutic by nature because they dealt with something which societies might otherwise have kept repressed (Panneerselvam, 1999). The Anzac myth, arguably, helps deal with the horrors of war in a way which is easier to confront, even

though it may not be the most 'truthful' method. As King (2003) outlines, myth becomes a 'buffer' for reality; "the effect of the tragedy on our country with such a small population was to make the ANZAC experience sacred, or a 'myth' – only in that way could such a vast human sacrifice be made comprehensible and acceptable in the public mind."

The myth becomes a method of accounting for failure or, as Schopflin (1997, p20) outlines, as "making cosmos out of chaos." This argument outlines that the myth helps to sustain social upheaval and secure the "cohesiveness of the community" in this time of crisis (Schopflin, 1997, p23). It does this through providing a distorted version of reality which is unwilling to acknowledge that war caused any breach to Australia's or New Zealand's developed coherence. It seeks to prove to others the worth of the Australian and New Zealand role in the war (McDonald, 2009). However, as will be argued in the discussion below, this 'buffer' is at the expense of the exclusion of many alternative interpretations of history and identity. It is argued to be at the expense of a distorted history.

A Deconstruction of the Anzac Myth

The major element of the Anzac myth is the idea of glorification of death in war. As Barthes (1993) outlined, particular value systems and structures of language come to create modern myth and, indeed, the use of emotionally loaded language and particular signifiers, related to notions of sacrifice and heroism, are central here. This element of the Anzac myth seeks to promote and elevate participation in war and death in war as something to be proud of and remembered with reverence. It is something portrayed as noble and a meaningful endeavour for all those who participate. It is about emphasising notions of a positive death, which is somewhat counter-intuitive, whereby ideas of tragedy and violence give way to bravery and strength. By pushing this idea of a positive death and a 'happy solider', the myth renders the solider experience as entirely

monochromatic (Sparrow, 2012). McQuilton (2004, p155) cites an interesting case study of one Private Rae. A member of his family described his death on the Gallipoli battlefield as a "terrible waste and tragedy", while members of the New Zealand 24th Air Training Corps described it as "the most proudest and honourable death a man can possibly die". A further example saw Reverend Watt stress the need to follow the ideal example set by the Australian diggers in Gallipoli whose "loyalty and sacrifice had brought them a brotherhood" and had shown them what it meant to be an Australian (McQuilton, 2004, p156). This idea is cemented in the Anzac Dedication which is recited at many ceremonies in Australia and New Zealand and which pushes this idea of a grand sacrifice: "We wish to be worthy of their great sacrifice."

It is about promoting a staunch façade or a usable past where soldiers become a "standard for emulation" (Schopflin, 1997, p55). It is about, as Overing (1997) outlines, reminding a community of its own ideal identity through the public process of defining and specifying its distinctive social norms through mythic discourse. The soldiers become like secular saints, or Jesus without the resurrection, and they are paired with signifiers which promote the 'ideal' Australian or New Zealander (Robinson, 2010). The myth orchestrates the collective forgetting of more painful details of the campaign and, instead, promotes a positive narrative which is easier to confront. The myth is about nostalgia and imagining and selective use of glorifying language. As Carlyon (2001, p25) outlines:

> *How was the Anzac soldier supposed to look? Lean and laconic, as he is supposed to be, wearing torn shorts and a cheeky grin as he brews tea, everything about him saying that war is just another hindrance or adventure ...or was he scared and bewildered and wasted by dysentery, as he isn't supposed to be, because these things don't sit too well with mythology?*

Through this process of selective language in the Anzac myth, the solider becomes a symbol of a 'true man' but at the cost of alternative, sometimes, more 'negative' interpretations, as outlined by Reynolds (2010, p28):

> *How does violence contribute to a nation's spirit of identity? Australia's Anzac rhetoric dwells on suffering endured but what of suffering inflicted? Sacrifice and dying are admired but what about the killing? Did the 'real man' need blood on his hands?*

This glorification of death in war, as an element of the Anzac myth, is an example of a militarisation of Australian and New Zealand history. This myth teaches society to valorise military endeavour and participation in war above all other forms of human activity and puts the solider on a pedestal above all other contributors in this Anzac period (McKenna et al, 2007). This myth selectively excludes other sets of values and social, civic and political traditions and pushes people to align themselves with, instead, militaristic values and practices. Lake (2009) outlines this prevalence within the Anzac myth by pointing out that war stories, war participation and military values have figured ever more prominently in Australian and New Zealand culture, school curriculums, literature and media. It has been highlighted that school teachers in Australia, for example, have become concerned at the way in which the militarisation of Australian history has come to dominate many classes and has almost desensitised children to the fact of killing in war (Lake, 2010). Anzac history has been "appropriated for militarist purposes and comprehensively re-written and re-framed in the process" (Lake, 2010, p138).

The myth presents a militarisation of Anzac and pushes the idea that military involvement, participation and values are vital to what it means to be an Australian or New Zealander. The ideal Australian or New Zealander is seen to portray qualities of a soldier in battle – selected qualities of bravery, masculinity, steadfastness, endurance, duty and honour. As Reynolds & Lake (2010) outline, Australians and New Zealanders are regularly told by the media, politicians and educationalists that their national values derive from military values displayed in battle by the Anzacs. Yet this is done

selectively through the myth, where there is no mention of alternative military values of aggression, conformity, obedience to orders and the capacity to kill people. As Bevan-Smith (2015) outlines, it almost makes murder and the reality of warfare respectable. It is a collective forgetting of these alternative interpretations of militarised Anzac.

What the Anzac Myth Excludes

Many alternative interpretations of Anzac, in this way, can lose out to this dominant myth and the processes of collective forgetting. The myth expresses strong emotion and involvement at an unconscious level and individuals become linked by such actions to all others who do likewise (Schopflin, 1997). Notions of a positive death and ideas around sacrifice and heroism expertly shifts public perception about Anzac in a particularly narrow direction, away from discussion and debate around Anzac. As Sparrow (2012) and Damousi (2010) outline, expression of strong emotion within this myth is used as a way to avoid discussion, circumvent debate and de-politicise war – it shifts from social critique and asking why we allow such atrocities to happen, to a veneration of sacrifice and an emotional story of service. It does not tackle ethical ambiguities or political tensions because this is not what the myth seeks to signify. McKenna et al (2007, p147) cited Anne Coombes in a 2000 Australian Sunday Morning Herald article which pushes the point of emotion as a distraction from the more fact-based interpretations:

> *What is going on in a country when thousands of its young people make a pilgrimage to a remote foreign shore, a place of human slaughter ... a new generation is being deluded, encouraged to commemorate those futile deaths instead of examining what caused them. Expressing awe when they should be expressing outrage.*

The glorification of death in war, structured by this sentimentality and nostalgia, renders many aspects of Anzac 'forgotten' or what Gigliotti (2003) calls 'unspeakable'. This is caused by a loss of language and correspondingly, the emptying of language and events of meaning, which has seen a continuing inability to communicate. In this way, the myth is profoundly 'ahistorical' in nature, as termed by Scates (2006), because it does not represent history and many of the facts of the conflict itself. For example, as West (2005) and Harper (2011) argued, it seems to matter little that the campaign did not shorten the war by a single day and was a failure in its goal to secure the Dardanelles, which experts say was not a realistic prospect in the first place. For nine months soldiers battled in horrendous trench warfare, where the allies suffered 140,000 casualties and where 80% of New Zealand soldiers were either wounded or killed. It is argued that this alternative, more fact-based interpretation of Anzac loses out to the dominant, glorified myth. What should be a lesson to later generations on the waste, horror and loss of war is instead a proud memory to be emulated. It is almost a national exchange where this waste of life is exchanged for, what Bevan-Smith (2015) calls, "the perceived benefits of nationhood and the masculine values that underwrite it: courage, duty, mate-ship and self-sacrifice."

The use of the poppy within this myth, as a symbol of glorified death, is central to this idea of certain ideas becoming unspeakable. As Overing (1997) outlines, symbols of myth have metaphoric value and serve a crucial social function in emphasising certain interpretations over others. The poppy becomes the face of the positive death portrayed in this myth and is a part of Australia's and New Zealand's national collective unconscious. It was first linked to the churned-up soil, stench and blood of the soldiers' unmarked graves in 'no-man's-land' because it was the first plant to grow there (Clarke, 2014). However, over time, the poppy has become emptied of this representation of death and these negative connotations of violence and stench have become unspeakable. Instead the symbol of the poppy has been sanitised and purified to become the face of a positive death, where the blood of the soldiers is encapsulated and made pure, noble and 'clean'. Society is encouraged to wear the poppy to honour these soldiers who died a noble and sacrificial death but, really, it is a

symbol voided of language, just as this myth is voided of language. As McDonald (2009) outlines, this not only distorts public perception of Anzac but also the private, inner stories of the individual soldiers and their varied experiences with death in Gallipoli. The horrors and more negative interpretations of war give way to this more purified version as signified by the poppy. It arguably romanticises and idealises the Gallipoli campaign, rather than allowing for alternative interpretations of horrible and messy deaths.

Along with this myth excluding alternative perceptions of an Anzac death, is the way in which it excludes other important Australian and New Zealand national identities –which further distorts the reality of Anzac. Myth, as outlined by Schopflin (1997), is a vital way in which nations determine and establish the basis of their own beings and identities along with their individual systems of value and morality. As such, this myth constructs a particular 'type' of person to emulate and honour and presents an exclusionary definition of what it means to be an Australian or New Zealander. It is argued to become something many people cannot engage with or relate to. As McKenna et al (2007, p6) outlines, "Other narratives of identity become marginalised at the expense of one monolithic, hegemonic legend" - that of a white, masculine, colonial male who upholds military values. As discussed above, this personified version of what it means to be an Australian or New Zealander is the soldier who enlists for overseas conflict, the soldier who kills and the digger who puts his life on the line. It is an essentialist image which ignores a civic conception of a more gender equal, multicultural and post-colonial environment. The influence of this identity reproduction is outlined by Tranter & Donoghue (2007, as cited in McDonald, 2009, p10) in a 2003 survey which saw Australians identifying the Anzac soldier as having more significance in the way they saw themselves and defined their values more than any other figure in Australian history. They linked their identity and way of life to the digger 'out of uniform'. The Anzac myth holds up this idealised and narrowly conceived 'digger or soldier' identity as superior and this means that many other important roles, experiences, identities and values associated with Anzac are excluded and sometimes collectively

forgotten. The most prominent of these is the exclusion of ethnic, female and pacifist identities and experiences.

Māori identities and values have largely become unspeakable and forgotten because of the dominance of this particular identity within the Anzac myth. The myth fails to properly highlight the active involvement of Māori in the war effort and deems ethnic stories and histories less important to national identity. The ideal, personified, identity constructed by this myth does not expand on ethnic difference and therefore does not rightly acknowledge the role Māori played in the war effort. This role amounted to 2,227 Māori and 458 Pacific Islanders serving in what became known as the Māori Pioneer Battalion, of which 336 died on active service and 734 were wounded (Ministry for Culture and Heritage, 2017). In many ways they are the 'forgotten Anzacs' because this contribution is barely recognised compared to the non-Māori soldiers and participants. Although it can be argued that the Māori contribution is becoming more recognised than the Aboriginal one in Australia, for example, such as recognition in the Auckland Anzac War Memorial Museum, it is still minimal in the wider scheme of Anzac commemoration as a whole. It is the idea that, because of this myth, Māori stories are known to history but are not known to the general community and, as a result, not rightly appreciated (Reynolds & Lake, 2010).

Similarly, female identities and experiences can be seen to be obscured by this dominant mythic identity of the white, male solider. This is the idea that males are eulogised in the Anzac myth and yet women are often overlooked despite the important role they also played. The myth has a spirit of overt masculinity and a strong focus on manhood, and the language associated with it deems many female experiences unspeakable. It is an example of myth creating boundaries on memory and history and seeking to define an 'ideal' identity (Overing, 1997). As Lake (2009) outlines, it is vital to assimilate women into this seminal national identity even though it is based in the masculine domain of 'manhood' and militarism because it is morally and ethically wrong not to rightly and equally acknowledge and appreciate their contribution. Women contributed as nurses, servicewomen, land

girls, widows, caretakers, nurturers, moral boosters and family providers, amongst many other roles but yet these are deemed subordinate within this conservative Anzac myth. War historian, Ian McGibbon, said despite women's work being seen as merely supportive, it still was not a safe or 'easy' role. The 10 nurses who drowned when the Germans sank the Marquette on October 23, 1915 in the Aegean Sea illustrates one example of the risk women faced going to war (McGibbon, 2001). The Anzac myth excludes these alternative identities which should be emulated, honoured and remembered. As such, it distorts the reality of Anzac and the reality of the female experience.

Another such excluded identity and experience within this myth is that of the Australian and New Zealand pacifist. As Sparrow (2012) outlines, the anti-politics of the Anzac myth diminishes the experiences of the millions of people who did not fight for various moral or ethical reasons, which is a valid part of our Anzac history. The myth portrays the soldier or enlister as the person to emulate and honour and the person who upholds values of courage and bravery. This portrays the idea that heroism is a quality best displayed overseas and the idea that people had to fight abroad to receive recognition and acclaim (Reynolds & Lake, 2010). However, this is not the case, as shown in the extensive work conscientious objectors did to uphold their alternative identity as peacemakers. In New Zealand, for example, by the end of the war, 2,600 pacifists had lost their civil rights whilst seeking to portray their differing identities, which has been argued by many as indeed an example of courage and bravery (Ministry for Culture and Heritage, 2015). The long history of anti-war movements and pacifism in Australia and New Zealand is not allowed for in the Anzac myth because language of militarism is dominant and language of anti-war and peacemaking is deemed unspeakable.

Christchurch Youth

Anzac has been argued to have been turned into a sacred myth which is a distortion and exclusionary representation of the reality of Australia's and New Zealand's past. It is seen to "sanitise and gloss over the lived experience" and promote an idealised image of the nation, binding us to a one-dimensional narrative of the First World War (Kilmister et al, 2017, p3). This debate sits alongside the media-based youth resurgence claim and, as has been previously discussed, neither debate fully develops the youth perspective. Both of these arguments are either speculation or theory and make assumptions as to how youth engage with Anzac and learn in the classroom. McKay (2013) outlined this critique when reviewing the 'Militarisation of Australian History and Culture Thesis' which is what he labelled this body of literature around Anzac myth. One of the key critiques was that this body of literature assumes that public celebrations are a clue to private sentiments (Davison, 2003, at cited in McKay, 2013). It is argued that valid conclusions about individual Anzac engagement and education cannot be made based on a 'peripheral' view of Australian commemoration and education because "teachers and students do not have messages about Anzac injected hypodermically into their brains so we need to know the various ways in which they engage" (McKay, 2013, p10). He outlined that this cannot be achieved without the use of conventional educational research methods such as in-depth interviews or ethnographies with students and/or teachers which is thus far missing from the Anzac debates. It became clear to me that the only way to critique or validate these claims was to ask youth themselves and situate the lived New Zealand experience within the context of the Australian literature.

Christchurch youth, year 12s and year 13s at secondary school, were chosen as a sample of New Zealand youth because they were the most geographically accessible to me in the time allowed within a Master's thesis. How this sample was decided upon and treated in an academic setting was carefully thought out and managed as will be discussed in Chapter 2. I will now contextualise

Christchurch youth in terms of what they are reported as doing on Anzac Day and, also, what they are seen to be learning about Anzac within the New Zealand curriculum. The debates of resurgence and Anzac as a sacred myth both appear within this particular context.

Christchurch youth live within a city which celebrates Anzac widely. For example, in 2016 there were 36 formal, organised ceremonies on 25th April around the wider Christchurch area (Christchurch City Council, 2016). This included a central dawn service, a midday citizens' service and smaller suburban services celebrating certain battalions and regiments, directed by different Returned Services Associations. These were held at a combination of community centres, parks and 15 separate war memorials, which included the Bridge of Remembrance that was reopened for the first time since the 2011 earthquakes.

This was a significant event in Christchurch because traditional Anzac services were disrupted and relocated after significant damage to historical buildings and monuments following the quakes. For example, the main dawn and midday citizens' services before the earthquakes were usually held in Cathedral Square, either within the Cathedral, alongside the Cenotaph or as part of a march involving the Bridge of Remembrance. These were historical Anzac sites in Christchurch but were all inaccessible because of extensive safety barriers. The reopening of the Bridge was seen to be a step back to traditional commemoration and it was estimated 15,000 people visited it during ceremonies on Anzac Day 2016. Christchurch RSA president, Pete Dawson, saw it as a milestone in the regeneration of Christchurch and a lasting reminder of the courage, service and sacrifice of the men and women of Christchurch (Mitchell, 2016).

Newspapers and media articles continuously commented on the presence and involvement of teenagers, young people and younger generations at the Bridge of Remembrance and other ceremonies in Christchurch. For example, one article argued Anzac has not lost its lustre amongst youth after the Anzac centenary despite what some people were predicting (Mitchell, 2016). Another article argued that youth presence at Anzac events in Christchurch is increasing each year

(Cannet, 2016). They claimed resurgence and 'lustre' yet, again, no one actually asked youth to what extent the earthquakes had actually influenced their engagement with Anzac and whether they were indeed more engaged as was being claimed.

Youth were also reported to be doing new activities such as the 'Serve for New Zealand' campaign started by the University of Canterbury Student Volunteer Army. This campaign was directed at all young people from universities, schools and the community to celebrate the Royal New Zealand Returned and Services' Association 100th birthday (Student Volunteer Army, 2016). It brings together youth for a day of volunteering as a way to honour the Anzac spirit, while also giving back to the community. It now occurs all over New Zealand, with 8,222 individuals having taken part to date (Student Volunteer Army, 2016). For example, 2,000 native trees were planted by a group of Canterbury youth in 2016, led by the Student Volunteer Army at Woodend in Christchurch. It was reported that this was an example of youth being more actively involved in Anzac commemoration than ever before yet, again, these were just claims and participation in such activities does not necessarily mean engagement unless otherwise specified by youth themselves.

Another way youth were reported to celebrate Anzac was through a new Anzac-themed filter on the youth-centred image messaging application, Snapchat. This was available for use in Australia and New Zealand on April 25th, 2016 and the Anzac filters included a wreath of poppies, 'Lest we forget' italicised text and a coin paddle specific to the Australian game 'two up' (Bogle, 2016). Snapchat also created a live compilation of images that produced a story of what youth were doing during Anzac Day across Australia and New Zealand. These included snaps from around New Zealand of youth in silence during the last post, youth at dawn services in Christchurch, youth with family members marching in parades, youth contemplating Anzac in their bedrooms and youth waiata and haka at Anzac ceremonies. This was the first Anzac-themed filter on Snapchat and was argued to cater to an increased youth interest in Anzac. Interestingly, this Snapchat filter was the closest any media outlet in Christchurch or New Zealand, came to in engaging directly with youth perspectives on Anzac.

Youth attendance in commemorations, involvement in the Serve for New Zealand campaign and interaction with the Anzac Snapchat filter were some of the major examples of ways youth were argued to engage with Anzac in Christchurch. Yet, as discussed above, participation does not necessarily mean engagement or a resurgence of interest unless specified by youth themselves.

Part of the Christchurch context also includes the New Zealand curriculum through which youth learn about Anzac. This is where some New Zealand academics argue a presence of the Anzac myth. Anzac is argued to be an important part of the New Zealand history curriculum, for example in 2016 former Education Minister, Hekia Parata, argued "Anzac brings communities together to learn about the sacrifice of their forebears and the part the war played in establishing New Zealanders' sense of identity" (Ministry of Education, 2016). History is offered as an elective in the final three years of secondary schooling and, in the first ten years of schooling, history is subsumed within the integrated subject of social studies (Sheehan, 2011, p37).The Ministry for Culture and Heritage (2017) outlines that Anzac is an integral part of these social studies and NCEA history programmes and can be explored as a significant current and historical event in New Zealand. For example, the Ministry of Education (2016) set up a variety of webpages providing teaching resources around Anzac on the centenary and outlined that the centenary brings the opportunity for rich and varied educational experiences for young New Zealanders. How Anzac is taught is up to teacher discretion and is based on these educational resources or NCEA units provided by the Ministry of Education. For example, the Ministry of Education (2016) outlined Anzac could be the basis of numerous research projects in NCEA history, such as Anzac's place in New Zealanders' national identity, New Zealand's experiences in war and how Anzac links to the major year 12 topic 'The origins of World War One'.

In the past decade New Zealand academics have started to critique how Anzac is used in the New Zealand social studies and history curriculum. These critiques are based on Anzac education being too narrow, too militaristic and too myth-like and not realistic of New Zealand's past. Barnes (2017),

a senior history lecturer at the University of Auckland, argues that when it comes to Anzac, students need to remember 'more' not simply remember 'harder'. She outlines that "for the war's impact on New Zealand to reach beyond the narrow national identity story we need a richer understanding of our past" (Barnes, 2017). This includes education on the home-front, the role of woman, the bravery of the conscientious objectors and Māori experiences. She argued that "we should lay down the burden of the old national identity story, and craft in its place a much fuller version of this part of our past" (Barnes, 2017).

Similarly, Sheehan (2015), a senior education lecturer at the University of Victoria, argues that over the last 25 years, history programmes have typically been narrow and exclusionary. Sheehan (2015) outlines that "young people are seldom encouraged to think critically about what Gallipoli and the 'Anzac spirit' means to them in this day and age because the version of the Anzac story that they are exposed to in schools (and in the popular media) is typically selective and minimalises aspects that are controversial or contested." He argues this can mean young people do not have the tools to participate constructively and critically in conversations about the past. He argued that for them to adequately engage with Anzac, they need to be educated in a way which means they can make reasoned judgements about the way significant historical events such as Gallipoli are aligned with present concerns (Sheehan, 2015).

Sheehan (2015) argues that students have a sense of the past whether they have studied it formally or not through films, novels, commemorations and historic sites. He argues that it is often these forms of entertainment which shape perceptions of the past, making it important for educators to teach a realistic and thorough version of our past which is not 'ahistorical' or narrow. However, similar to Barnes (2017), Sheehan often sees history in schools as a "lost opportunity with history teachers delivering programmes that largely ignore the experiences of marginalised peoples" and rarely engages with women's history and cultural history (New Zealand History Teachers' Association survey, 2005 as cited in Sheehan, 2015). Such alternative Anzac perspectives are often not given as

much weight as the dominant masculine narrative and often teachers still treat these people less as the agents of history and more as objects of manipulation by those in power (Levstik, 2003 as cited in Harcourt & Sheehan, 2012). History teachers are seen to favour the dominant military, masculine framework which constructs an archetypal male New Zealand character as a definition of society as a whole, which pushes the belief that "New Zealand nationhood was established by the performance of these men at war" (Harcourt & Sheehan, 2012, p76).

These arguments sit in line with the idea that Anzac has become a sacred myth which narrows youth education and insight. Christchurch youth sit within this argument which, again, was seen to only assume this disengagement occurs rather than basing it on youth perspectives. Christchurch youth were argued, via popular media, to be engaging with Anzac in unique ways and New Zealand academics were arguing they had a narrow understanding and insight of Anzac because of their education. I wanted to know where youth actually felt they were situated within these debates and what factors were influencing this. I wanted to know what they thought would help change this apparent narrow curriculum and reignite engagement or, on the other hand, perhaps this engagement was already occurring and the academics were making incorrect conclusions.

Overview of the Thesis

In this chapter, I introduced my exploratory case study which seeks to collect, engage with and accurately present the voices and perspectives of Christchurch youth in regard to their particular experiences and engagement with Anzac. I outlined my goal of understanding how the Anzac experience is framed, taught and internalised by youth and whether they seek to comply with or challenge this aspect of our New Zealand history. I discussed the reason I chose this topic by contextualising Anzac resurgence, Anzac mythology and youth in Christchurch and presenting a gap to be filled in the literature and the wider Anzac debate. The debate was seen, on the one hand, to

present a resurgence of youth engagement with Anzac and, on the other hand, to present the idea that Anzac has become an exclusionary myth which distorts Australians' and New Zealanders' understanding of wider Anzac experiences and educates them in a narrow, militarised way. This debate was seen to be missing youth perspectives and seen to merely assume what engagement was occurring. I outlined that I would fill this gap by talking to youth in an academic setting and give them space to respond to these assumptions about their engagement. I introduced Christchurch youth as a sample of New Zealand youth and, more specifically, discussed how they fit within this wider debate. I outlined how they were reported as engaging with Anzac commemorations and what academics were saying about how they were being educated about Anzac. I outlined that the only way to critique or add to the claims of resurgence and myth-making was to go to youth directly and seek to situate their perspectives within the debate.

In Chapter 2, I outline the thought processes I went through and the decisions I made when it came to the research methodology. I outline how I decided upon a particular participant criteria which could be used as a sample of New Zealand youth as a whole and the ways I went about recruiting them. I present my research cohort and outline the importance of its scope and diversity. I also discuss the data collection methods and the use of qualitative questionnaires and semi-structured focus group interviews and their strengths and weaknesses as tools to collect relevant, in-depth data. I outline the collaboration I had with the Educational Research Human Ethics Committee and the Ngai Tahu Consultation and Engagement Group to make sure the methodology design was rigorous and robust but also ethical and culturally sensitive. Finally, I present thematic analysis as the best way to deal with this particular data set and I outline the steps I went through to make valid and robust conclusions.

Chapter 3 offers powerful insights into the ways youth engage with their Anzac education. I present the argument that indeed Anzac has become a myth which distorts youth understanding of wider Anzac experiences and educates them in a narrow, militarised way. I argue that elements of this

myth in Anzac education make it hard for students to engage with Anzac despite the fact that many of them were actually interested in learning and understanding it. These distorted elements are each discussed, showing the ways in which they hinder student engagement with Anzac. These elements are the idea that Anzac is taught as a 'simple narrative' which does not allow room for critique, that it emphasises a link between Anzac and national identity, that it disregards many alternative Anzac experiences and that it presents a particular New Zealander identity to internalise. It will be argued that students are active agents in their own Anzac engagement and education proven in the way they acknowledge the myth and its negative influence in the classroom, push against it and critique it.

In Chapter 4 I examine the factors which are seen to enhance this active process of critique. The students are viewed as being armed with the knowledge and tools to critique the Anzac myth and to actively respond to the ways it is seen to limit their understanding of Anzac in the classroom. This thesis suggests six factors which enhanced this process. These factors are ancestral ties to Anzac, research into personal Anzac stories and experiences, unassessed educational units, centenary discussions, an understanding of hardship through the earthquakes and alternative perspectives of the Anzac experience through access to the internet. These factors are seen to enable the students to push against the mythic elements of their education because they present a broader understanding of Anzac perspectives and experiences which the students could use as comparisons in the classroom. These factors are seen to enhance student engagement with Anzac and encourage the continuance of active critique.

In the closing chapter, Chapter 5, I summarise how exactly the students' perspectives and experiences with Anzac fitted into wider debates around Anzac mythology and Anzac resurgence. I outline some key methodological limitations around sample size and scope which I believe could be easily remedied if future research was to be done in this area of youth engagement with Anzac. I finish with a concise review of the recommendations the students made throughout the analysis

which they thought would make their Anzac education more robust, interesting, engaging and representative of the Anzac reality.

Chapter 2: Methodology

Participant Criteria and Recruitment

Deciding on a rigorous and robust methodology for this thesis was a challenge because I had to both cater to my research question, which sought the representation of Christchurch youth, and also weigh up the ethical and cultural implications of using Christchurch youth in an academic study. As such, I engaged with and gained the approval of the Educational Research Human Ethics Committee (ERHEC) and also drew ideas from similar studies within New Zealand and Australia which dealt with how to engage with youth and treat them in a fair, unbiased and reciprocal manner. One such study was done by Sheehan (2011), which looked at historical significance in the New Zealand secondary school curriculum, and another by Clarke (2008), which looked at historical engagement within the Australian history curriculum. This engagement with the ERHEC and these two studies influenced my decisions around methodology, particularly in terms of the specific participant criteria and participant recruitment.

In Chapter 1 I discussed how the idea for this thesis began when I discovered a particular age bracket in New Zealand whose voices, I felt, were not being considered when it came to conversations around Anzac engagement and education. This age bracket could be defined as young people or youth within New Zealand between the ages of 12-24 years (Ministry of Youth Development, 2014). As the idea for the thesis developed, I began to understand the reality of narrow time parameters for this study and the type of youth I would need to engage with in order to attempt to gain a representative sample of voices within this time. I realised the need to develop a particular participant criteria within this broader youth definition in order to uncover what my research question sought in the allowed time and scope of the study.

The particular participant criteria I decided upon was Christchurch secondary school students, years 12 or 13, aged 17 or 18 and who would volunteer and consent to be involved. The first part of the criteria around Christchurch upper level secondary school students was based on understanding the narrow time parameters of this study and the need to gain as much insight within the time allowed. I realised schools would be a door through which I could gain access to youth and I surmised that youth still at school would have a fresher knowledge as to how education and engagement around Anzac occurs within the New Zealand curriculum. Both Sheehan (2011) and Clarke (2008) used schools as an avenue to engage with youth and both saw current school children as having the best understanding of local curriculums and teaching systems. Clarke (2008) weighed up whether to visit primary schools or high schools and concluded that she needed to focus on what year-group history is explicitly taught to in school, and at what age students were most likely to have a comparable understanding of their nations past and how it is taught. She concluded that this insight would come from students from the middle to upper years of high school, which also aligned with Sheehan (2011) who used secondary school students aged 17-18 years to gain insight into the New Zealand curriculum.

The criteria also required participants to volunteer and consent to be involved. This decision came out of my ERHEC consultation where it was discussed that a voluntary basis would be the most ethical way to deal with the participants as it would allow them to withdraw from the project at any time, or refuse to answer any question without penalty. The ERHEC advised me that consent is vital to maintaining ethical practice and so consent forms and information sheets were distributed and signed prior to participation. Each participant who was under 18 years of age was also given a consent form for their parent or caregiver to engage with and sign before the research began. These consent forms outlined the rights of the participants as volunteers in an academic study.

I struggled with the fact that this criteria saw the exclusion of youth who live outside Christchurch, leave secondary school early, are outside the age and year group bracket, are home schooled or

have already finished high school to pursue work or tertiary study. These youth could not be included within the scope of this study because of time constraints that were in place and the limited scope of a Master's thesis. I felt that it would be vital to engage with them in the future, with more time and scope permitting, in order to gain a fuller understanding of how New Zealand youth engage with Anzac. With this in mind, I wanted to make sure I fully represented the criteria of participants which I had chosen. This required me to follow the recommendations of Sheehan (2011) and Clarke (2008) and draw from a range of school sectors and socioeconomic groups in order to gain a representative sample. This included reaching out to state, private, rural, urban, single sex, coeducational and religious schools - all in the hopes of gaining access to students from different genders, backgrounds and ethnicities. I set about emailing every secondary school in Christchurch with my attached information sheet, asking staff and teachers if they would like to participate and offering them the opportunity to ask any questions of myself or my supervisors. If interested, the teacher was asked to gauge student interest in their classes, making sure they expressed the voluntary nature of the study.

In the end, seven schools agreed to take part, giving me access to 37 students. As Table 1 shows, each school and student remained anonymous for ethical reasons, agreed upon by myself and the ERHEC, which will be discussed later in this chapter. The table shows the key features of each school, highlighting the diversity of the cohort and the number of students who volunteered from each school.

Table 1: The Participant Cohort

School Number	**Key Features of School**	**Number of Students**
S1	Rural, state, co-ed	5
S2	State, co-ed	4

S3	State, co-ed	7
S4	State, single sex boys	5
S5	Private, single sex boys	6
S6	Private, single sex girls	5
S7	State, co-ed	5
Total: 7		**Total: 37**

The seven schools who participated represented and gave me access to a wide range of student perspectives, which I felt was a positive start in trying to understand how youth engage with Anzac. As Table 1 shows, I drew from a variety of different schools with rural, state, co-ed, single sex and private schools included. The students within this cohort represented a variety of ethnicities, with New Zealand European, British, Chinese and Māori represented. I knew it was important to present this range within multicultural New Zealand and I was particularly pleased to have the perspectives of three Māori students. The ERHEC and I agreed that their voice is particularly important to represent as our indigenous population because they are often not consulted in research as frequently or as fairly as New Zealand European participants are. Later on in this chapter I will discuss the process I went through with the ERHEC and the Ngai Tahu Consultation and Engagement Group to ensure their fair treatment.

Another key feature of the schools and participants, which I had trouble deciding whether to present or not, was different religious voices. Originally, I predicted that different religious voices would add another dimension to the discussion around Anzac and I was pleased to have voices from Catholic, Protestant and Anglican religions. During the interviews I made note of the ideas coming from those who had specified their religion and discussed with them their views but in the end I decided not to

include this as a key feature of my discussion (and it is not included in Table 1). I realised that religion was not something the participants considered or saw as important when discussing their engagement with Anzac. As such, when reviewing my transcripts, there were no succinct differences to note in comparison to significant ones between genders, rural and urban divides, state and private divides, and ethnicities, for example. Perhaps this could be something developed and discussed further in future studies as this lack of connection between religion and Anzac was interesting but this was not a feature of my cohort which I decided to focus on.

Overall, I felt I extensively represented my chosen criteria in terms of diversity of youth and I felt the large number of participants helped to present key comparisons and contrasts within the data. Looking at other studies, I felt backed-up in this conclusion - for example, Sheehan (2011) recruited 87 students across seven schools for his larger scale study and found this gave him insight into multiple perspectives and represented diversity within New Zealand. Based on this, I concluded that the scale and variety of my schools and participants was a good basis on which to make some robust conclusions about youth in Christchurch.

Data Collection: Qualitative Questionnaires and Semi-structured Focus Group Interviews

The engagement I had with this large variety of participants had to be extensively thought through if I hoped to gain a clear insight into their understanding of Anzac. I needed to make sure I used data collection methods which would encourage them to open up their world to me, while still feeling safe and secure in the research environment. The way I wanted to do this was very similar to Clarke (2008, p8) who outlined that her research was never intended to be a statistical analysis but a means to "explore some of the ways in which students connect with the past... to present a range of voices from the classroom rather than tables of survey results." I sought in-depth qualitative methods

which would allow for this and decided upon a combination of qualitative questionnaires and one semi-structured focus group interview per school group.

The qualitative questionnaires were decided upon as a means to introduce the students to the broader Anzac topic, to give them time to understand the specific research questions and to engage with them before the semi-structured focus groups began. The questionnaires included open-ended questions around Anzac in terms of friends, family, national identity, national values, gender, religion, ethnicity, schooling and teaching methods. I gave them the questions I was to use in the focus group and also some more straight-forward questions which I hoped would ease them into the harder discussion questions. The questions all allowed room for the student's own personal narrative and train of thought. They were told to email me or talk to their teachers about any questions they had around the terminology and ideas within the questionnaires. I hoped this data would complement the data I gained in the semi-structured focus groups and fill in some information gaps which might occur when we were face-to-face.

Interestingly, the qualitative questionnaires did not prove as useful as I had hoped. Not only did less than half the participants complete the survey before the semi-structured focus groups but the ones who did provided minimal detail. Upon reflection, I realised I had made the questionnaires too long for many of the busy students to complete in the time allowed and the questions I used did not seem to prompt any personal narrative or train of thought. The time commitment I had predicted, of one to two hours per questionnaire, was just too much alongside the other commitments these students had. The ones who did complete it did not seem to understand that there was 'no right answer' and were quite reserved and stunted in their answers. Many discussion questions were skipped and no one student completed the whole questionnaire, so there was not much to use for my own analysis in terms of comparisons and contrasts between schools and students. The questionnaires should have been explained face-to-face before they started and any questions they had should have been brought up for everyone to think about there and then. In this way, I decided

not to use the data gained from the questionnaires in my analysis because they fell short of eliciting any quantity or quality of in-depth data. Fortunately, where the questionnaires fell short of providing a space for the students to openly discuss their experiences with Anzac, the semi-structured focus groups excelled.

These seven semi-structured focus group interviews which I undertook were decided upon because of their overall success in providing in-depth data in a variety of studies which I reviewed. These included Clarke (2008), Sheehan (2011) and two alternative studies by McCormack (2015) and Due Theilade (2010), done with youth in New Zealand. McCormack (2015) successfully used focus groups with youth to study disengagement from secondary schooling in New Zealand and Due Theilade (2010) used the same methods successfully to study sexual negotiations amongst New Zealand and Danish students. These studies presented to me the advantages of using focus groups, how to practise them in a way which successfully achieves these advantages and what issues I needed to consider when undertaking focus groups.

Clarke (2008) and Due Theilade (2010) presented the key advantages of undertaking focus groups as a data collection method. Both outlined that focus groups provided a relaxed environment for in-depth conversation, which I saw as vital to understanding youth engagement with Anzac. Clarke (2008) found that focus groups were less intimidating for students and less like an interrogation or test and more like a conversation amongst peers. She saw this as in comparison to individual interviews, which had the potential to make younger participants feel pressured and on edge and less likely to speak openly with just a researcher to engage with. In her study, Due Theilade (2010) drew on ideas from Kitzinger (1994) and argued the focus group environment had the potential to open up social worlds perhaps usually hidden from the researcher. The idea was presented that, “while what people say in public or semi-public conversations with a researcher often differ from private conversations with groups of associates and friends, focus groups may facilitate talk that is similar to such conversations” (Kitzinger, 1994, p117 as cited in Due Theilade, 2010, p47).

The potential of participant self-censorship was something I had to consider before going forward with focus groups. Due Theilade (2010, p46) outlined that at times focus groups can be limited in providing useful data when "participants do not wish to share intimate or challenging narratives due to peer pressure, dominance of some individuals or the urge for peer recognition." Hertz (1997, as cited in McCormack, 2015) also outlined that young people may filter what they say based on what they think the researcher's intentions are. Mertens (2009) outlined that to minimise the impacts of self-censorship, there needs to be group and researcher rapport, reciprocity, transparency and comfortability. I worked hard to provide these things, starting with introducing myself and greeting them in a friendly manner and then discussing the detailed information sheet outlining my intentions. An informal discussion occurred before every focus group, where we talked about the importance of everyone's opinion and the idea that there was 'no right answer'. I let them know my intention to be there as merely a facilitator of discussion giving them agency over the session. The teacher who was present at these sessions also helped me to enforce the importance of both supporting each other's opinions and questioning them in a non-confronting manner. Along with this, the particular elements of the focus groups, as will be discussed below, helped to encourage this non-confronting and comfortable environment which sought to allow for relaxed and open talk.

Each school took part in one of these semi-structured focus groups at a time and a place which was decided upon by the participants. This was in order to make them feel comfortable, with the goal of eliciting more intimate talk and to not unduly interrupt their timetable (Due Theilade, 2010). These sessions tended to be on the school campus, in either the classroom or the library, during either lunchtime or a school period if this was signed-off by the teacher of that period. The semi-structured focus groups went for one hour each, which worked well in fitting in with the students' timetables and covering most of the ideas in my topic guide. Each school had between four and seven volunteers in each focus group, which matched Clarke's (2008, p9) study which argued this number was the basis for a "good balance between gauging students' individual opinions and generating discussion between them." I felt I had space to engage with each student at one point or another,

without any one student's voice being disregarded. The teacher who I had liaised with to gain volunteers was asked to sit in on each focus group to enhance the comfortability of the students and to be there if any questions and queries arose. I worried that the presence of the teacher as an authority figure may unduly influence what the students said but, as Clarke (2008) also found, the students did not seem fazed by this presence and some of the teacher prompts actually helped to spur more discussion within the focus group.

Each participant gave consent for the semi-structured focus group to be audio and video recorded and to take part in the focus groups with the other volunteers at their school. The combination of audio and visual recording was done to ensure I captured what each student was saying because I knew focus groups could have moments where more than one person was talking at once. This worked well, especially during moments of animated debate, because I was able to determine where each idea was coming from during the transcription process. I decided to make my focus groups up of people from the same school who were likely to know each other, rather than mix them up with other schools. This was done because Due Theilade (2010) highlighted that association between members often facilitated more relaxed, safe and open talk. I also wanted their ideas to be based on their experiences of learning within a single sex school or a rural one, for example, and I wanted them to be able to bring different perspectives to these features of their learning, rather than mixing them all up together. It allowed me to better compare the focus groups because as Due Theilade (2010) outlined, drawing upon Wilkinson's (1998) argument, it was interesting to see how the participants interacted, constructed and challenged their identities in these different settings because dynamics between these group constellations differed greatly.

The semi-structured nature of my focus groups was another way I sought to gain in-depth data and combat self-censorship. I attended the focus groups with a topic guide, or a list of open-ended questions, which was only ever meant to be used as a guide without a set order to be adhered to. This was in comparison to a structured focus group which would have followed a set question list,

not allowing for much deterrence. My topic guide was made up of discussion questions around the key themes I had identified within the Anzac myth and how education around it may occur. These questions were related to individual experience with Anzac Day ceremonies, the changes to Anzac following the Christchurch earthquake, national identity, national values, Anzac traditions, the Anzac persona, gender, religion, ethnicity, and teaching methods. Interestingly, focus groups are usually semi-structured like this in order to fully make the most out of the conversational nature of the group dynamic. McCormack (2015) outlines the benefit of semi-structured focus groups in allowing a flexible approach for young people to digress or contribute different perspectives to the gathered voices. It allows young people to "answer if they want and talk naturally, rather than in a forced manner" (McCormack, 2015, p56). I found this is exactly how my participants behaved, where they each interpreted the questions differently and found different spaces within the conversation to expand on narratives or ask questions. I was able to encourage and facilitate this fluidity without the pressure of getting through a set list of questions in the time allowed. I let the participants discuss what they thought was important and I think this proved to them that I was willing to listen to and take on board exactly what they wanted to say without question or contradiction. McCormack (2015, p56) summed up this benefit clearly, "depowering the researcher and giving the participants agency over the conversation reduced the lack of connection or distance between researcher and participant and allowed for a relationship which helped to facilitate openness."

In practice, my semi-structured focus groups allowed for the open conversation and interaction which Clarke (2008), McCormack (2015) and Due Theilade (2010) had also found. In-depth answers and discussion around my topic guide were elicited and a comfortable and safe environment was set up to minimise self-censorship. This conversational nature of focus groups provided me insight into the students' specific experiences of Anzac which, in practice, the questionnaires had not allowed for. As Due Theilade (2010, p47) also found, the focus groups allowed me to "access the vocabulary of different social groups, a vocabulary which may not be so readily apparent in a one-to-one interview." I found I got insight into the fluidity and shifts in meaning around Anzac because I was

able to watch and record "participants responding to the particular stimulus of another's reflection" (Due Theilade, 2010, p47). Focus groups provided an environment where information could be expanded upon and discussed in whatever ways the participants felt necessary. The relationship between research and participants promoted story-telling, discussion and questions and provided an excellent data set from which I felt I could draw comprehensive conclusions.

Ethical and Cultural Considerations

This relationship between researcher and participant was something I had to pay careful attention to because I wanted to ensure I behaved ethically and ensured the participants' wellbeing throughout the study. As mentioned above, this required me to engage with and gain the approval of the ERHEC and the Ngai Tahu Consultation and Engagement Group. I considered problems that may arise in terms of potential emotional and cultural stress, anonymity and the treatment of Māori participants.

Through engagement with the ERHEC, I realised the possibility that my research may open up participants to potential emotional stress and cultural offence. The subject matter of the study involved questions around remembering dead relatives, thinking about wartime New Zealand and different ways of commemoration and remembering, which is often different between participants. Participants may have remembered actions and events which may have been emotionally unsettling for them at the time. When in the field, I made sure to minimise these risks as much as possible by discussing them during the informal start of the focus groups and letting the participants know they could stop the interview at any time, refuse to answer a question or withdraw from the research project entirely if they did not feel emotionally or mentally comfortable with the content of the project. I also provided them contact numbers of local counselling services, if they needed someone to talk to, and had the supervisory teacher present as another support person for them. I ensured that all of my questioning was as neutral as possible so as not to convey to the participants my own

opinions and potentially offend a participant's own views and beliefs. I mediated all discussions between participants with different opinions and allowed each participant time to explain their perspective without feeling singled out.

The ERHEC also outlined to me the importance of anonymity as a means to keep participants safe from potential backlash or negative responses to this study. Complete anonymity of participants could not be guaranteed as I engaged with them and they also engaged with each other in the face-to-face focus group environment, however I made sure that at no point would these identities become public. This was achieved by disguising as much identifying material as possible in this thesis. School names were excluded and replaced with numbers, as seen in Table 1 above, and each school was only linked with the key features of that school which was required for analysis purposes. In addition, only my supervisors and I had access to the identifying video material and to the transcripts with student names, which were excluded from the thesis.

Part of this ethics process was consultation with acting research consultant Nigel Harris of the Ngai Tahu Consultation and Engagement Group. This was important to ensure I would be culturally responsive and that Māori participants would be understood and protected. Nigel and I identified ways my research could affect Māori and which, therefore, I needed to think about carefully. These were that my research would have significant Māori content, that it would have Māori involvement through the participants, that it would seek and analyse Māori data and that it may have negative impacts on Māori.

Throughout the research project, Māori participants were consulted in all matters relating to the research to ensure that they were comfortable with the process. The supervisory teacher was presented to them as a support person to go to if they felt any misunderstanding or oversight was occurring. Consent from Māori participants was vital to ensure they were aware of all intentions and steps within the study. I clearly outlined to them that I intended to learn about the experiences and perspectives of Māori youth in regards to Anzac in a safe and open environment which they could

withdraw from at any point. I made sure they knew their rights as volunteers in this study who would remain anonymous, could stop the interview at any time and/or refuse to answer a question or withdraw from the research project entirely if they did not feel emotionally or mentally comfortable with the content of the project.

As I am not of Māori descent, I understood I would be interviewing Māori participants as an outsider. I realised this could impact my ability to interview Māori, due to the fact that they may be unsure of my ability to understand any references to their culture. It was therefore incredibly important for me to get advice throughout this research project from Nigel as a cultural advisor. I learned ways of approaching Māori and ensuring that there was no cultural oversight. For example, it was necessary during the interview process to clarify Māori words and aspects about the Māori culture which I did not understand. By clarifying what was meant with the participant during the interview, it helped ensure that there was no misunderstanding or offense and that the representation of Māori within the research project was accurate. Furthermore, to ensure that the data I gained from my Māori participants was treated respectfully, I sought to write a balanced thesis which gave a fair and accurate representation of all the participants and their experiences. I made sure I presented Māori perspectives as clearly and accurately as possible.

Data Analysis: Thematic Analysis

In order to rigorously analyse and relate these perspectives, and those of all my participants, to my research question, I used thematic analysis. This is a "method for identifying, analysing and reporting patterns or themes within data" (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p80). I chose thematic analysis because McCormack (2015) outlined it as working well with focus group data which was argued to be useful for indentifying emerging themes, broad ideas and common threads of knowledge. It was argued to

be a flexible method suited to rigorously analysing a complex qualitative data set such as focus group transcriptions (McCormack, 2015).

I drew influence from Braun & Clarke (2006) who presented key phases of thematic analysis to think about. The first phase had the goal of familiarising yourself with the data through transcription, re-reading and noting down common threads or contrasting ideas (Braun & Clarke, 2006). I decided to do the transcription myself, with the goal of gaining a more thorough grasp of my data set, and each interview was transcribed verbatim. Next, I set about manually coding any interesting features of the data set. This was done in a "systematic fashion across the entire data set, collating data relevant to each code" (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p82). I decided to do this manually, rather than through software, again with the goal of gaining a better grasp of my data set by choosing this option. I manually highlighted and annotated the transcripts using a colour-coded approach. This helped in pairing together data units that contained repeated responses and allowed what Woodcock (2010 as cited in McCormack, 2015) outlined as a coloured trail of evidence through which the eye can perceive patterns at a glance.

Next, I started collating codes into groups of potential themes. Braun & Clarke (2006, p82) outlined that a relevant theme "captures something important about the data in relation to the research question, and represents some level of patterned response or meaning within the data set." Collation was based on whether I thought a particular data unit captured something important in relation to the overall research question, rather than ideas which were the most prevalent, for example. I wanted the themes to develop an understanding of how different participants and schools engaged with Anzac. I needed my themes to consider how the background of each participant, and the key features of each school, as shown in Table 1 (above), influenced this engagement.

This stage of thematic analysis required me to constantly consider what factors were the most influential and how these factors worked together to allow varying engagement with Anzac. I

needed to highlight what exactly was influencing this engagement and how this differed between schools and participants. I consistently checked that these themes represented my coded extracts and the entire data set and then I started generating a thematic map, or a master list of themes, to present what I saw as the most important and overlapping patterns (Braun & Clarke, 2006). I asked myself some key questions about my thematic map to make sure I was being fair to and representative of my data set. These are outlined by Braun and Clarke (2006, p95):

What does this theme mean and what are the assumptions underpinning it?

What are the implications of this theme?

What conditions are likely to have given rise to it?

Why do people talk about this theme in this particular way (as opposed to other ways)?

What is the overall story the different themes reveal about the topic?

Each question helped me with the process of developing, reviewing and defining each theme. It was important that this thematic map presented the overall story the analysis revealed and also related directly back to my research question.

The final phase of the analysis was the production of the thesis. This phase involved the presentation of the thematic map as a means to answer my research question. Braun & Clarke (2006) outlined that the production of the analysis needed to be a coherent, concise, logical and non-repetitive account of the story the data tells which seeks to convince the reader of the merit and validity of the conclusions. It required the selection of "vivid, compelling extract examples" to enhance and justify each argument within the analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p82). These extracts needed to be carefully chosen as those most likely to clearly and succinctly present an important point. Each point needed to be discussed in terms of the literature and the ways the literature both enforced or contradicted these ideas. It was important to make sure analysis was not just a description of the data but a presentation of an argument in relation to the research question. This step was the final

one in making sure the analysis both fairly represented the data set and sought to answer my research question.

Summary of Chapter 2

In this chapter I outlined the thought processes I went through and the decisions I made when it came to the research methodology. I outlined how I decided upon a particular participant criteria which could be used as a sample of New Zealand youth as a whole and the ways I went about recruiting them. I presented my research cohort and outlined the importance of its scope and diversity. I also discussed the data collection methods and the use of qualitative questionnaires and semi-structured focus group interviews and their strengths and weaknesses as tools to collect relevant, in-depth data. I outlined the collaboration I had with the Educational Research Human Ethics Committee and the Ngai Tahu Consultation and Engagement Group to make sure the methodology design was rigorous and robust but also ethical and culturally sensitive. Finally, I presented thematic analysis as the best way to deal with this particular data set and I outlined the steps I went through to make valid and robust conclusions.

Chapter 3: Secondary School Students as Active Agents in their Own Anzac Engagement and Education

In this chapter I explore the ways in which the 37 secondary school students I interviewed situated themselves within and responded to debates around Anzac engagement and Anzac education in New Zealand. Based on the students' perspectives and discussions, it will be argued that indeed Anzac has become a myth which distorts youth understanding of wider Anzac experiences and educates them in a narrow, militarised way. Elements of this myth in their education were seen to make it hard for them to engage with Anzac despite the fact that many of them were actually interested in learning and understanding it. However, the important point to be argued in this chapter is that the majority of the students were very much aware of the limitations of the myth to their understanding of Anzac and it is not something which they were just simply accepting and internalising. The students were seen to be active agents in their own engagement and learning of Anzac, in that they were able to recognise the elements of their Anzac education which were mythic, narrow and distorted, push against them and question what it was about these elements that they did not agree with or could not align themselves with.

The elements of their education that they highlighted as distorting their understanding of Anzac was the idea that it is taught as a 'simple narrative' which does not allow room for critique, that it emphasises a link between Anzac and national identity, that it disregards many alternative Anzac experiences and that it presents a particular New Zealander identity to internalise. These elements will each be discussed in turn and I will seek to prove both the presence of the Anzac myth in New Zealand and the ways in which students can be seen as active agents in their learning through acknowledging the myth, its negative influence in the classroom and, too, their means of separating themselves from it.

Engagement with Anzac as an Active Process

In Chapter 1 a significant body of literature was presented arguing that Anzac has become a sacred myth which distorts Australians' and New Zealanders' understanding of wider Anzac experiences and educates them in a narrow, militarised way. This body of literature outlined that Anzac has become a myth or a socially constituted form of communication by which Anzac is transmitted, received and remembered. It was argued to be a selective means of collective forgetting which presents a particularly narrow version of Anzac and which represses memories and the re-imagining of ideas.

A discussion of the New Zealand curriculum reinforced that Anzac had become a sacred myth which narrows youth education and insight. Anzac education was argued as being too narrow, too militaristic, too myth-like and not realistic of New Zealand's past. For example, Sheehan (2015) argued this can mean young people do not have the tools to participate constructively and critically in conversations about the past. He argued that for them to adequately engage with Anzac, they need to be educated in ways which mean they can make reasoned judgements about the way significant historical events such as Anzac are aligned with present concerns.

These arguments from Chapter 1 assume that students internalise, receive and remember the Anzac myth in particular ways. It was argued that certain realities of Anzac become unspeakable or forgotten and the myth is something which is passively accepted and unquestioned. The myth, as I have outlined it, suggests that some features of it at least have unconscious underpinnings. That we accept a story, a myth, because somewhere in our 'unconscious' we have heard the story from various sources and in different ways and we accept that this way of remembering must be right. It should be noted that my use of the unconscious is not necessarily psychoanalytic, as Freud may have understood it. That while I am utilising Jung's idea of a collective unconscious, this is not Freud's, which is where our 'common' understandings of the unconscious emerge from. My use of the

unconscious is linked to the excluding and re-imagining of events that myth evokes which is not something we are actively aware of, as outlined in Chapter 1.

In this way, students were argued as not having the tools to participate constructively and critically because their Anzac education is indoctrinating them to accept a narrow reality. This argument assumes students are passive and uncritical in the influence of this myth on their knowledge and engagement with Anzac when, in fact, the perspectives of youth I gathered argued that they are actually pushing against the myth. The interviews proved to me that they can actively recognise the effects this narrow myth has on their understanding of, and engagement with, Anzac and that they can still hold valid opinions separate from what they are learning.

The students were able to discuss with me what it was about their Anzac education that they disagreed with or found too narrow and militaristic. They were able to take a step back, critique the way their education and society's collective unconscious is shaped by a myth and discuss the elements of this myth which they felt particularly distorted or hindered their engagement with Anzac. As McKay (2013, p10) argued in Chapter 1, "Teachers and students do not have messages about Anzac injected hypodermically into their brains so we need to know the various ways in which they engage." They indeed were not passive agents absorbing every aspect of their mythic education, instead they engaged critically and reflexively.

I will now explore the elements of Anzac education which the students highlighted as distorting their understanding of Anzac. These elements will each be discussed in turn and I will seek to prove both the presence of the Anzac myth in New Zealand and the ways in which students can be seen as active agents in their learning through acknowledging the myth and pushing against it.

Anzac Education as a Simple Narrative which Shuts Down Critique

The students found that their Anzac education was being delivered as a simple narrative, or a narrow story, which hindered their ability to engage in it deeply and to open up an environment of critique. They saw their education of Anzac as being almost story-like, with the same simple ideas told each time. They often could not remember a time when there was something being taught which was different to they called a simple tale, reductive story or idealised narrative. One male from S3 (state, co-ed) described the simple narrative in saying "the teachers never really go into any real detail, like uh...no causes or consequences, it's quite one sided like we were right and we did well." A female from S1 (rural, state, co-ed) agreed and said "it's never really deep thinking though ... it's pretty basic ... it's too simple like it doesn't allow for us to understand how life really was or how it all really was ... it's so idealised. Like the story is we were loyal to Britain, we were right in sending men away, we lost but it was important to our country." This was in line with Clarke's (2008) findings in Australian schools where she found the students could not engage with a parochial Anzac story which simplifies the past.

The participants from all backgrounds and schools agreed in their feeling that the simple narrative dulled, rather than piqued, their interest and engagement with the Anzac reality. This narrative was not something they passively accepted or internalised as truth, instead they realised exactly what about it they disagreed with and how it could be improved in the classroom. For example, a female from S3 (state, co-ed) said "all sides of the story should be told ... it isn't just about brave men killing bad people. It shouldn't glorify war. Too repetitive, same story. Need different perspectives." Another Māori female student from S7 (state, co-ed) emphasised her faith in students like herself to make such critiques, "you don't really know how to question education at primary school age, now we are more engaged and we think more and have a better perception of things." She praised her age-group for having the capacity to learn but outlined that they needed the opportunities to do so.

The students were actively pushing against their Anzac education which, they argued, was mythic and negatively influencing their understanding of Anzac. As Clarke (2008) argued, student historical understanding needs to be expanded upon rather than limited to any simplistic or uncontested national narrative.

Although my participants felt they could openly share these critiques of their education with me, they felt that often in the classroom the simple narrative is presented as fact and truth which sets up an environment that shuts down questions or contesting ideas. This was true for all the other elements (which will be discussed below) which they highlighted as distorting their education. Often following their critiques there was nervous laughter or silence and they seemed to be waiting for me to 'correct them' or tell them off. They had intelligent and evidence-based critiques but they were still nervous to see what response they would get. It appeared they were used to an environment that did not allow room for open discussion and critical thinking. For example, this piece of dialogue between three female students and one male student from S3 (state, co-ed) shows how hard it is to openly critique or question what they are taught in the classroom:

S3 female -The minute you have any opposing opinion whether it's right or wrong you immediately get cut down for that. I'm not allowed to say the story is boring without a teacher breathing down my neck. You are seen to not belong to your country and not belong.

S3 female - If you disagree with it or say it's narrow you are seen as a terrible person.

S3 male - Teachers need to be open minded.

S3 female - They preach diversity and everything but as soon as you show a different opinion or side to the story...

The students felt like they were unable to critique the way their education around Anzac was delivered to them without fear of teacher judgement. They felt that in the classroom they were treated as passive vessels to be filled with an incontestable version of Anzac which was positioned

outside of an environment of critique. A male student from S1 (rural, state, co-ed) argued that "a lot of stuff is put on a pedestal and if you wanted to say something critical about it you would probably be shut down 'cause it's a 'big' part of history and you aren't allowed to touch it." Perhaps this is why the literature on Anzac assumed students were accepting and internalising this simple narrative as truth because any criticisms were not being openly discussed in the classroom. Lake & Reynolds (2010, p23) found this was also true of Australian society where "critical analysis of the Anzac legend risks inciting charges of disloyalty or treason." The avenue for active student engagement was being shut down in the classroom but that did not mean that it was not happening within the minds of students.

The Anzac narrative was arguably too much ingrained in society's collective unconscious to be questioned. Kilmister et al (2017, p2) argues that this is caused by an emotional over-investment in the Anzac story which has been internalised and which provokes the belief that "asking critical questions of it is tantamount to betraying Australia's soldiers and their families, both past and present." In contrast to this, however, the students did not want to betray Anzac memories by critiquing what they were taught, they just wanted to know more than the simple narrative they were being fed. They had a respect and interest in Anzac history but felt that the version they were being taught was distorted and narrow. A female student from S7 (state, co-ed) outlined this, "they don't go in to much depth, for our age group it would be good to go into more depth because then you can start asking questions that people might not want to hear but which is good to know." Clarke (2008, p51) agreed that such critical engagement it important in the classroom, "questions aren't about demolishing the past, or demonising it, but they are a prerequisite for a critical reflection on what it represents." These students were ready to engage and learn and yet in the classroom environment, underpinned by this myth, their critical thinking and ideas were shut down.

Anzac and New Zealand Identity

A further element of their Anzac education which the students critiqued was the emphasis on a New Zealand identity being directly developed from the Anzac experience. This proved again the presence of the Anzac myth in their education but also showed how they were able to actively acknowledge it and critique it without accepting it as truth. This was a distorted element of their education which every school highlighted in different ways. They students outlined that everything they are taught about Anzac is then linked to their modern day identity and New Zealand values. They wanted to learn and engage with Anzac but became 'annoyed' and 'pissed off' when they would then be told that New Zealand identity derives from the glorified military values of Anzacs. They wanted to appreciate the values that the Anzacs showed at that time without being influenced into thinking they have to be like them in the modern day context. A male student from S1 (rural, state, co-ed) outlined this critique:

S1 male - Anzac reinforces the beliefs and values you are 'supposed to have'.

Me - What are these beliefs you are 'supposed to have'?

S1 male - Being strong and tough and willing to fight and outdoorsy and brave, that kind of thing. Like so dominant on military stuff. Back then people were perhaps supposed to be those things and the following years after the wars have put this identity into us. New Zealand can become more inclusive away from this Anzac identity. Someone who isn't particularly sporty or strong or brave may not feel included or feel like a kiwi. We are made to think it is part of our country but it isn't me as a person. Leave it in the past.

He felt like the Anzac myth pushed on him certain ways of being and behaving which he could not relate to. It was not that he was not interested in learning about the Anzacs; it was that he wanted to keep his own identity separate from this militarised Anzac identity. A female student from S6

(private, girls) was particularly critical of the way their education emphasises New Zealand identity coming out of Anzac, "modern New Zealanders and Anzacs being one in the same is the information you are fed to believe. We've been brought up to look at New Zealand Anzacs as glorified war heroes and the ultimate modern New Zealand citizens, therefore when we look at them we aren't allowed to see anything else." Another female student from S1 (rural, state, co-ed) agreed in saying "I don't like to think our identity comes out of war and the Anzacs at all even though we are made to think it does." Again, these students were critical of the way in which they were also told to link an Anzac military identity to what a modern citizen stands for. They wanted to learn about Anzac experiences and identities without having to relate it to their own identities which they saw as very separate.

Literature shows that this emphasis is also profound in Australia. Lake & Reynolds (2010, p1) outlined the presence of this influence on Australians, "the Anzac spirit is now said to animate all our greatest achievements". Donoghue & Tranter (2015) also found in their survey of Australians that 90% of them associated Anzacs with national identity, which suggested that Anzacs play an important role in relation to contemporary national identity. It seems that this part of the Anzac myth has become part of society's collective unconscious and something which is accepted as truth. Clarke (2008, p45) found that the students she talked to also explained their understanding of being Australian as "inextricably linked to a national character forged at the beaches of Gallipoli." She found that students tied the importance of the Anzac story to themselves individually, and their own personal interest in history became indistinguishable from the collective sense of national identity it evoked (Clarke, 2008).

The students I talked to did not respond to this aspect of their mythic education in this passive way that Australians in Clarke's (2008) study were presented as doing. They did not accept this emphasis on Anzac identity being representative of modern-day identity as truth and, although their education suggested that it was perhaps part of wider society's collective unconscious, it was not part of theirs.

They were able to actively separate themselves from this idea and push against the claims this myth was making. For example, a female student from S1 (rural, state, co-ed) argued, "I can recognise the person the Anzac is presented as and I can honour and appreciate this separate to my identity. I can separate and appreciate what was done. I can realise there is more than this type of military person even though this is the general perception. I can see more angles." Similarly, this dialogue between male students from S4 (state, boys) shows the ways in which they can identify the two identities as being separate and still show interest in Anzac:

S4 male - Anzac is only a part of it, a lot of other things other than those values contribute to our identity.

S4 male - We are more liberal and progressive now, but can acknowledge them still.

This element of their mythic education limited their engagement with Anzac because they did not agree that the Anzac identity was representative of modern-day identity. However, instead of accepting it as truth, because the classroom did not give them room to critique, they instead acknowledged what was happening and separated themselves and their identities from it. They did this while still holding an interest in learning about Anzac identities and values.

Alternative Anzac Experiences and Identities

The students highlighted the critique that their education emphasises the idea that New Zealand identity is shaped by the values Anzacs were seen to hold. When looking at this critique in more depth, I realised it was not just the values they felt were being pushed onto their modern-day identities but also a particular 'type' of person. They argued that the narrow narrative they are taught predominantly presents the white, masculine, militaristic male as the 'primary' Anzac identity to valorise. Many students found that this distorted their understanding of, and engagement with,

Anzac because most of them, again, saw their identities as very separate and, also, found that this emphasis on a certain 'type' of person in their education meant they were not learning about other Anzac experiences and identities in similar depth.

The primary Anzac identity which every school argued was constantly taught to them as being representative of the Anzac experience was that of a white male upholding the military values, as outlined above. Two students from S1 (rural, state, co-ed) outlined this prominence:

S1 male - It always seems to be that one white male guy, pretty young, 18-20, full uniform, gun over his shoulder. It's the same strong person in our education linked to us now.

S1 female - Yeah, male, strong, white, brave, willing to do anything.

Similarly, a male student from S3 (state, co-ed) agreed upon this dominant image, "You think about the young, white man as an Anzac, that's what you envision and that is what you are taught." The students all agreed this was the primary Anzac identity which was taught and which was seen to link to their modern-day identities. However, some students were more critical of this element of their education than others were. For the purposes of this discussion the more critical group will be labelled Group 1 and the group who were less critical will be labelled Group 2.

Group 1, who were in the majority, argued that this element of their education was an example of the simple narrative excluding other Anzac experiences and identities which, they felt, should be learned about in just as much detail. They argued that this Anzac identity they currently learn about, which is apparently linked to their modern-day identity, is difficult to relate to, especially by those who hold female or multi-cultural identities. A female from S2 (state, co-ed) argued that her education was presenting a narrow experience, "the Anzac story constructs a particular person to honour, which isn't very flexible. The simple narrative constructed gives us the white heroic guy. It's the default state of Anzac, the white male, but what about others? I can't relate to that." The

students in Group 1 critiqued this element of the myth in their education as being inflexible and narrow and, in particular, exclusionary of Māori and female identities.

The three Māori participants in this study were particularly critical of this exclusion. They were not at all passive in their education and did not agree that this element of their education should be accepted as truth. They were able to clearly separate themselves from the mythic, narrow narrative and realise there was more to learn. A Māori female student from S7 (state, co-ed) outlined this critique and how it frustrated her that her education diminished this valid experience and identity:

S7 Māori, female - You always think Caucasian - we had and have New Zealand European and New Zealand Māori people not just New Zealand European.

Me - Can you explain this more to me?

S7 Māori, female - In my head the first thing is a Caucasian. The Māori battalion is just presented as not as significant as Caucasian, if it is presented at all. I don't want to learn about just New Zealand Europeans, let's be real, New Zealand wasn't and isn't just New Zealand European, it was and is Māori as well and that's important to acknowledge. Why teach just one side of it, that's not really fair to them or really anyone.

Similarly, a Māori female student from S6 (private, girls) outlined that "we are never really told about the particular battalions in Anzac, no specific details, more talked about general white soldiers going off and fighting." The element of the myth that the Anzac was a white person had simply not been accepted as truth by these students. Their education reflected a wider acceptance of the myth in society's collective unconscious but they were able to actively critique it and present it as a distortion of the truth. This dialogue between the male students at S4 (state, boys) showed the realisation of this distortion in their education:

S4 British male - The most noticeable contribution in our learning was the white colonial, we only recently touched on the Māori battalion.

S4 male -We hadn't heard about it before that though.

S4 male - I still haven't learnt anything about the Māori battalion.

S4 Māori male - Me neither, I would like to have learned about it. It could be an inspiration to Māori and Pacifica kids, or like a way to engage better. It's the truth, why don't we learn the truth?

This dialogue shows that the students were aware that there was a truth about Anzac which was separate to their mythic education. This dialogue also showed that it was not just the Māori students who were critical of this exclusionary narrative. Both males and females of self-titled New Zealand-European descent from different schools wanted to learn about Māori experiences. For example, this piece of dialogue from S6 (private, girls) shows other students advocating for the inclusion of the Māori narrative:

S6 female - The Anzac story largely revolves around the Caucasian 20-something male, that's the image. But I don't think it should be portrayed in that way because there were other people like Māori soldiers.

S6 female -You hear about the Māori battalion on the news sometimes.

S6 female - It's not sort of public or common knowledge though.

S6 female - I wish we learnt more about that.

Similarly, this dialogue from S7 (state, co-ed) showed that this exclusion of other identities frustrated the students:

S7 female - When I think of Anzac I don't think of any other ethnicities at all because you don't really hear of them existing at school. I don't resonate with the image of the white male soldier at all though like where is everyone else's stories?

S7 female - We aren't taught about it now and it's so many years after. It's like not dealing with or acknowledging it. If you are going to learn about Anzac you should learn about all of it and then maybe link it to our identity now.

S7 female -There were Māori and Asians, and we are a multicultural society. If they aren't going to teach the whole thing they shouldn't really bother at all.

Both the Māori and non-Māori students in these examples were active agents in their education and realised there was more to the simple narrative than this narrow identity. It was seen that they wanted to engage with Anzac but the simple narrative did not allow for further explanation of these ethnic identities and so they were feeling frustrated and, in many ways, disengaged. It frustrated them that this narrow identity not only diminished other Māori experiences but was also linked to their modern-day identities. They could not understand how a purely white identity could be linked to their modern-day multicultural society. They were very aware that this element of their education was mythic and they actively pushed against it.

This was also true for Group 1 when it came to the exclusion of female identities and experiences within their education. The primary Anzac which they learnt about was the white male and they saw this element of their education as diminishing of female identities and experiences as nurses, servicewomen, land-girls and those upholding other roles on the home front. The students in Group 1 wanted to learn more about these experiences and identities. For example, two female students from S2 (state, co-ed) argued:

S2 female - To this day I know very little to nothing about the women in the war. It's all about the men and dawn services uphold this.

S2 female - I would like to learn about everyone else – like the women not just the white men.

They wanted more diversity in the Anzac identities they were presented with in the classroom. They were interested in the roles they held and the changes to their lives but the myth was distorting an

understanding of this. They could not understand why a female identity was seen as subordinate to that of a male identity, as outlined by a group of females from S3 (state, co-ed):

S3 female - Also what about the women, the nurses, the woman at home sewing and working, it's not publicised or celebrated, why aren't they seen as important?

S3 female - Even if the women didn't go to the front lines they still risked their lives as nurses – you don't have to be on the front line to be involved in the war and celebrated.

S3 female - Yeah we should just be taught it. We don't get a choice to learn about the men so why can't we also learn about the women.

These students were resisting this aspect of the myth and were disappointed that their education did not include more diverse experiences. The myth gave them the male experience but diminished that of the female experience. There were also male students in Group 1 who actively pushed against this narrow reading of Anzac. They had similar sentiments when it came to the inclusion of female experiences and identities in their education. For example, a male from S2 (state, co-ed) argued that their education should be about "celebrating and relating to everyone who participated, not just the men. It should specify everyone who participated like the women." Similar to what the females were arguing, he wanted to see more diversity in his education about Anzac. This was the same for the male students from S4 (state, boys):

S4 male - I don't think it's right to exclude the nurses, they played a huge part and were in just as much in hospitals in Europe, the regular housewife too - she had to do everything at home.

S4 male - I reckon we should be taught what they sacrificed too, they had to take over from the men and run New Zealand.

S4 British, male -They took over in the factories and took the jobs, they played a huge role in war.

S4 Māori male -We don't learn about this role, or go into detail.

S4 male -No we don't, they were the driving force in keeping New Zealand going.

S4 British male -We aren't taught about servicewomen either - this could be a good role model to young girls today, showing what they are capable of.

The male students in Group 1 wanted to learn about female experiences and identities because they recognised they too played a big part in the Anzac reality. These examples also highlighted the idea that perhaps if the whole story, rather than the narrow version, was told, then the students might not mind having this identity linked to their contemporary ones. Their education was giving them a narrow Anzac identity to be linked to their modern-day identities which they could not relate to because it was simplified down to that of a white male with military values. The students could not relate to this but during discussion of wider Anzac experiences, such as wider gender and ethnic identities, the student often showed pride and highlighted elements of commonality. For example, during discussion of these wider identities, phrases such as 'they are role models', 'I can see myself in that identity' and 'this inspires me today' started arising. It showed that this myth was distorting an engagement with Anzac which the students desired. It was not Anzac, in its reality, which the students were disengaged from and pushing against, it was the myth and its simple, narrow narrative.

The simple, narrow narrative was not only negatively influencing student engagement with Anzac but was also distorting wider education. For example, one Māori female from S7 (state, co-ed) brought up the idea that not only does the myth often exclude female identities all together but when it does include them, it enforces sexist stereotypes. She critiqued her education and its exclusionary nature as shown in this argument:

S7 Māori female - The Anzac is more a guy than a nurse or anyone else, all you think of is guys, like it relates back to stereotypes that males are like the strong ones who protect our country blah blah blah like there are just knowingly reinforced stereotypes in it, like tough men went out to fight for New Zealand and little pretty nurses, you know, cured them or whatever and had romances. I don't

think we are aware of different stories than these. The first thing I think of when I think of Anzac is male soldiers, I don't really think of females and nurses as they actually were, I didn't even know there were servicewomen, you just assume it's males. But surely something basic should be 'what was the actual role of women at the time' and it's not something we actually know about. It's something basic to know. It's pretty basic to me. Like telling us that women helped out significantly is a pretty basic statement, but we are never taught that.

Although this student was seen to actively push against the myth, she highlighted the point that it can still have an effect on her by enforcing negative gender stereotypes. This was problematic for the students because this was the identity which was linked to their modern-day identity but this was not how they saw themselves, or positioned themselves, in terms of gender roles. They saw this stereotype and identity as narrow and exclusionary and not at all similar to how they saw themselves today as equal peers in the classroom. Feminist protestors in Australia have critiqued this negative effect the myth can have by highlighting the ways in which it sustains a "particular, gendered construction of the Australian experience of war and of Australian national identity" (Thomson, 1994, p201). As McDonald (2010, p291) argued, there becomes a "genuine danger of all other narratives of Australian identity being marginalized at the expense of one monolithic, hegemonic legend ... this is indeed a concern, not least given the range of exclusions (especially gendered and racial) involved in most readings of the Anzac." The primary Anzac figure of a white male not only excluded other perspectives but also marginalised them and positioned them as less important and less relevant to history. It also positioned them as less important and relevant to today's society because of the way the myth enforces the link between an Anzac identity and a modern-day one. In this way, I admired these students for challenging the myth and, in that way, standing up for a more inclusive New Zealand identity. They did not passively accept that this mythic identity was the only one to be celebrated and valorised. They actively critiqued the myth and acknowledged other experiences and ways of seeing oneself.

With these arguments in mind, a discussion of the perspectives from Group 2, those students who were not so critical of this emphasis on the white male identity will now be discussed. For example, the male single-sex group from S5 (private, boys) was seen to accept this part of their education with little critique. They did not seem to mind that Anzac military values were linked to their modern-day values and they did not see the need to fully separate themselves from it. This piece of dialogue between three of the five male students shows this complacency with their education:

S5 male - Anzac provides the values of a New Zealander and what we think of ourselves. When we think of a New Zealander we don't think of a solider but we think of the solider values.

S5 male - Courage, commitment and comradeship to quote the values of the defence force and that's pretty much us as kiwis.

S5 male - Definitely some similarities with the Anzac stereotype – these values line up because New Zealand was so proud of the Anzacs, the stereotype of the Anzacs is intertwined with New Zealand values.

S5 male -To be an Anzac it's about defending our country and values so they are one and the same.

These male students from S5 (private, boys) accepted this element of their education with little critique. They did not see a problem with accepting a militarised, white, male Anzac identity as being one and the same as a modern-day New Zealand identity. In fact, they transferred defence force values directly to modern New Zealanders. They found that this was not an element of their education which limited their engagement with Anzac, unlike what it did with other students from different schools. When asked why they could so easily link the two identities, they outlined that the Anzac identity is perhaps one they can relate to better than other students. They saw themselves in the 'primary' Anzac identity of the young, strong, sporty, brave male going off to war. At this point in our discussion, the S5 (private, boys) History Head of Department (HOD), who was sitting in on this session, interrupted and addressed the male students, "You guys are really showing some white,

male, chauvinistic identities, I mean come on, what about other identities in being a New Zealander and an Anzac?" One of the male students replied and said, "But this is just our view sir." Although I was initially frustrated that this teacher had interrupted the students' train of thought, this comment did prompt further explanation as to the ways these students were accepting of this emphasis on white, military males in their Anzac education.

Their argument was based on the idea that this white, military, male identity was just a representation of the 'main' identity which was involved in the Anzac experience. For example, two students sought to outline this:

S5 male - When you personify the Anzac in your head you can't have 18,500 personifications, you have to chose the one which fits the majority and considering, whilst recognising there was the nurses and the Māori battalion and other races, the main kind of group was white military New Zealanders, they were the majority so we imagine and link ourselves to them.

S5 male - Of course there were other stories but the majority of people fighting was European males. When I think about the Anzac they are always white, male, 20s - this is not exclusionary, this is just fact, those who fought should be honoured because they were the majority.

They did not have a problem with linking this identity to their modern-day one and accepting this element of their education because they saw this white, military, male identity as representative of the majority of the Anzac identities and therefore saw it as relevant to their education and to themselves. This acceptance of the myth showed that perhaps it had become part of their collective unconscious. Perhaps this had something to do with their self-titled collective identities as white, strong, sporty males but then those males with the same self-titled identities at other schools were more critical of their education. Perhaps, then, it had something to do with their specific private schooling but the fact that their HOD of S5 (private, boys) was so critical of what they were saying suggests this is not something he condones in his teaching of Anzac at this level. Perhaps, then, it had something to do with their family influences and what their families had internalised into their

collective unconscious. I argue that it was a combination of these factors which moulded the acceptance of this element of their education. Their identities, their schooling over their lifetime and their particular family influences were all things they brought up over the course of the interview as influencing their overall view of Anzac. The specific combination of these things is arguably what made their ideas different from those of other students.

These male students valorised military identities and related them to their modern-day identities. They saw white, male soldiers as the largest identity of the Anzac period and so accepted this part of their education and identity with little critique. Interestingly, other students in Group 2 were also not as critical about this emphasis of white, male soldiers in their education. They too understood this identity to be the majority and therefore the most common identity to learn about. The difference to the S5 (private, boys) students, however, was that, although they could understand the emphasis on this primary identity in the classroom, they did not emphasis it to the same extent and they were also still very critical about relating this identity to their modern-day selves. They could recognise that the white, male, military identity was something that was emphasised because this was a large identity of the time in terms of numbers and, also, in terms of how many of this group were killed. They could also see other identities as important, along with this primary identity, which was something the S5 (private, boys) male students did not highlight in as much detail. For example, a female from S2 (state, co-ed) argued that: "The men were the ones who went out there though, and died. So perhaps they are more remembered as more important? I can understand why they get this attention but I don't like how it is only ever the men who we hear about. Like I want to hear about them all but so many of these men died so they do deserve some emphasis." Similarly, the group from S3 (state, co-ed) acknowledged the emphasis on the soldiers but also the rightful presence of other identities:

S3 male - It should be about the soldiers because they went out there and did it – no woman has got a Victoria Cross then but there were women involved.

S3 female - The men did make the ultimate sacrifice, they do deserve the most recognition but there are also other aspects which don't get the recognition which they deserve on their own scale.

S3 female - These smaller scale identities were significant to the war – but we aren't taught about this. They didn't step out on the front line and shoot people but this doesn't make them unimportant but I still get why the soldiers were important.

A female from S6 (private, girls) added to this argument by acknowledging why this primary figure may have come to the forefront of their education:

S6 female - Directly following the war the main focus was the men who died, this was the biggest part, the 18,000 men, yes so many women died and the home front was a huge part of the war, but directly after the war people obviously, naturally focused on the biggest aspect of the war which was these men who died, brothers, fathers and sons who died, yes there were other aspects but yeah.

These students from Group 2 did not critique the primary identity to the same extent as those in Group 1 because they understood why the white, military male held a dominant part in the Anzac reality. However, they did not think it should ever diminish the experiences and identities of other female or Māori identities. They understood the identity of the white, male solider as prominent because of the scale of this group and also the fact that this group suffered the most fatalities. This did not mean they would emphasis this identity themselves but they could recognise why their education might. Despite this acknowledgment, however, they still did not want to link this identity to their modern-day ones. Unlike the male students from S5 (private, boys), they did not see military values and identities as important to their contemporary ones. They saw too much time as having passed, which made this identity unimportant to their own. They saw their own social and cultural milieu as having evolved away from an emphasis on military identities. They highlighted their New Zealand reality as nuclear-free with a limited military force, which does not link to their understanding of Anzac.

They understood that by linking this military identity to their own in an evolved society, they were part of what, they argued, was a process of glorifying war. They did not want to be part of a process which pushes the idea that military involvement, participation and values are vital to what it means to be a New Zealander and, by linking their identities to that of the primary Anzac identity, this is what they felt they would be doing. For example, this dialogue between students at S2 (state, co-ed) shows their hesitation in linking the two identities:

S2 female - I think linking that identity to us today uplifts something which we don't believe in, we don't uplift war anymore and we don't think it's heroic to do war anymore.

S2 male - It's dangerous to link it to us 'cause then people think if they go to war they will be remembered like the Anzacs but war these days does not have to be the answer.

S2 female - It promotes quite traditional ideas of heroism and success, which is archaic today. Like it's not us now and we don't want to enforce those archaic ideas.

The way in which the myth seeks to link the primary Anzac identity to a modern-day one was not something these students would accept. They saw it as detrimental to the values they sought to uphold in a society which did not value war to the same extent as it used to. They were proud of this minimal value they associated with war because they saw it as proof of an evolved identity and society. They could understand how this identity had come to be prominent in their education about the past but this was the extent of their understanding of their relation to this military identity.

Summary of Chapter 3

Both groups actively criticised their education and its mythic elements rather than just passively accepting them. Students also related to these elements in different ways, as seen in the difference in opinions between Group 1 and Group 2 and the more extreme opinions of S5 (private, boys). All

of this showed how the students were seen to be active agents in their education – they could highlight parts of their education as mythic and analyse why they could not engage with it and how it was distorting their learning. It did not show a resurgence in interest or participation in Anzac like Chapter 1 suggests but it does show that students are attempting to engage with Anzac despite the presence of mythic elements. These mythic elements were seen to hinder their engagement but not extinguish it. The students were seen to critique their Anzac education but this was not stopping them from wanting to learn and engage with this element of New Zealand's past.

Sheehan (2015) argued in Chapter 1 that a mythic education means young people do not have the tools to participate constructively and critically in conversations about the past, yet my investigation showed the fallacy of this claim. The students were more actively involved with their learning than they were given credit for. They indeed could, and did, have constructive and critical conversations because they were not willing to accept every element of their education as truth. If they perceived an element of their education as mythic, they pushed against it. They were able to make reasoned judgements about Anzac and were not just passive vessels to be influenced by their mythic education.

Chapter 4: Factors which Enhanced Secondary School Student Engagement with Anzac

In this chapter I explore the factors which were seen to enhance secondary school engagement with Anzac. This chapter will discuss which factors gave the students the knowledge and tools to critique the Anzac myth and actively respond to the ways their education was limiting their understanding of Anzac. This knowledge had to be coming from somewhere and it obviously had a strong influence on the students because, as seen in Chapter 3, their education had elements which was limiting their engagement with Anzac but, despite this, they still were able to stay interested in and critically engage with Anzac.

The factors which I found to be encouraging this continued interest and engagement with Anzac were ancestral ties to Anzac, research into personal Anzac stories and experiences, unassessed educational units, centenary discussions, an understanding of hardship through the earthquakes and alternative perspectives of the Anzac experience through access to the internet. These factors influenced the students to push against the myth and to critique elements of their education in the classroom and helped enabled the students to be active agents in their own Anzac engagement and education.

Ancestral Ties to Anzac

Ancestral ties to Anzac were an important factor in encouraging Anzac understanding and engagement outside of the classroom. These links were seen to prompt student personal and emotional engagement with Anzac and to give them tools with which to respond to the myths that were being presented in the classroom. For example, a male from S4 (state, boys) had an ancestor

who worked as a nurse during this time and so his engagement was based on honouring her: "I think engagement depends on if you had family involved, like I push for all stories to be told in our education 'cause so often my ancestor's story and those like hers get missed out, it's not fair." A female from S7 (state, co-ed) also engaged with Anzac more closely because she wanted to honour this family relationship: "I think Anzac is important - my mum has told me about it and how it's related to my family which makes it important for me to understand and ask questions." A male from S1 (rural, state, co-ed) agreed that those with ancestral ties are more likely to regard Anzac in more depth: "I don't know of any of my family fighting in any of the Anzac conflicts and I'm not close to anyone who did. So I don't have that personal connection with it. I don't really look into it or think about it as much as someone who does have a connection would. They ask more questions and want more than what we are taught."

Knowledge of ancestral involvement in Anzac was seen to influence students to critique their education and look into and think more about Anzac. It inspired engagement, but often a specific kind of engagement separate from what was being taught in the classroom. A female student from S1 (rural, state, co-ed) argued the benefit of this specific engagement: "If you have family involvement you learn more about Anzac and have more of a, like, linkage or tie so you want to know the truth." This knowledge of family involvement and experience gave them something with which they could compare to what they were being told in the classroom. Like the student who had an ancestor who was an Anzac nurse, the students often felt an obligation to make sure the stories which inspired their engagement were being presented in the classroom. They were able to actively critique elements of their mythic education because they were armed with knowledge and interest in different perspectives and readings of Anzac. Lake & Reynolds (2010) agree that ancestral ties can create a context through which critical thinking is encouraged. It was outlined that "the right to dissent from Anzac mythology and celebration was grounded in and justified by a history of family engagement in war" (Lake & Reynolds, 2010, p106). Knowledge of this family engagement was said to give people a better understanding of the Anzac reality separate from the myth. It was said to

empower people not to necessarily accept what they were being told as truth but to look deeper and think more critically about different perspectives and realities.

Research into Personal Stories and Experiences

Research into personal stories and experiences was another factor which was seen to prompt critical engagement with Anzac. Similar to ancestral ties, this research was seen to encourage personal and emotional engagement with Anzac which armed the students with tools with which to respond to the myths which were being presented in the classroom. Students found that research into personal and individual stories gave them more perspectives to consider and more of an idea of what the Anzac reality was, separate to the myth they were being presented with.

These individual stories could be ancestral or not but the key was that they opened up students to individual experiences rather than just the general, simple narrative. A male from S2 (state, co-ed) argued this point: "Knowing names of individuals, knowing who you are being taught about - it makes it more personal and more engaging, you ask more questions." A female from S3 (state, co-ed) also outlined that "if personal connection isn't there it's harder to understand, like, we often look at the overall campaign but not delve into individual stories but they are what opens our eyes." This research into personal stories and experiences gave the students more perspectives to engage with and more knowledge than the myth was giving them. They would often research family links or specific people they had heard about at commemorations and they found that this allowed them to better understand the Anzac reality. This research often occurred at home because the classroom environment and curriculum did not provide sufficient opportunity for it to occur. For example, throughout their entire Anzac education, the students told me about only one NCEA internal which let them pick an individual person to study. The students who were offered this internal were often inspired to then do more of their own research at home because they engaged so well with this

individual knowledge. They also would often want to do it at home because this internal only allowed them to study servicemen who went overseas. It reinforced the primary Anzac identity of the white, military male and gave them no other options for research. A female from S3 (state, co-ed) outlined her frustration with this internal: "When we did an NCEA research internal on a specific Anzac we weren't allowed to study a woman, it had to be a New Zealand serviceman who went overseas and fought. I wanted to do a nurse but couldn't." They wanted inclusion of this kind of research at school but it either was not included or, when it was, it merely reinforced the primary Anzac identity of the white, military male.

The group of females from S6 (private, girls) felt very strongly about the importance of individual stories as a means to encourage engagement. They felt that this research prompted emotional investment in Anzac and motivated them to want to know more details and perspectives about Anzac. They wanted more of it to occur at school because they outlined that their education, as it was now, lacked substance without this kind of research:

S6 female - Looking at it on a personal level gives us insight and appreciation. I don't think people have a good understanding of their own family involvement because you don't do this much at school.

S6 female - Because in order for history to be enjoyable you have to have some kind of emotional investment in it. It's taught on a very general basis so it's difficult to invest emotionally into the understanding of it.

S6 female - Year 9 and 10 is the most defining time for people to be interested or not. I did an internal on my great-great-uncle and that made it really interesting for me and I got involved and could ask more questions.

S6 female - The general youth of society are failing to see that war affected all of our families back then which I think should be undergone from an early age - the appreciation that it did affect your

family one way or another. If you just listen to a lecture sometimes it just doesn't seem real and it's so narrow, to make things seem real you need to look at personal level not general aspects.

S6 female - Not just a story like what we usually get.

S6 Māori female - Kids can say 'aw my family did this and my family did that' or whatever, going back and seeing how our grandparents and that were affected.

S6 female - I can relate and question what I learn because I have that personal knowledge about my family and connection.

S6 Māori female - Going back and looking at family connections should be compulsory at school, own investigation.

S6 female - In the school context looking at a personal perspective ... you're not actually appreciating what happened unless you look at personal lives of the people. This should happen at primary school so when it comes to high school you have already established this appreciation and you want to invest more time into researching about it.

S6 Māori female - Previous knowledge of individuals means you are more interested and ask more questions at school because you know certain things and you don't need to grasp it then and there. We are interested in it but partially uneducated 'cause we aren't learning about these personal stories.

These students saw research into personal lives as vital to their engagement with Anzac. They were critical of their education as being only a 'narrow story' without this kind of learning. The students saw themselves as more able to ask questions and critically engage in the classroom if they had this knowledge of individual perspectives and experiences. They felt that without this knowledge they were actually 'partially uneducated' because they believed that this knowledge was vital to their overall understanding and engagement with Anzac. They could not understand how they could respond to and ask questions of Anzac learning in the classroom without it.

Harcourt & Sheehan (2012) also outlined the importance of this wider and more individual experience of history. They argued for 'affective learning activities' to achieve this. Affective in this context meant "using imagination to recognise appropriate feelings, listening to and entertaining other points of view, being caring, sensitive and tolerant towards other people" (Harcourt & Sheehan, 2012, p13). An example of this would be getting students to engage with evidence showing a variety of perspectives and experiences, such as photos of graduating nurses and nurses on board a hospital ship (Harcourt & Sheehan, 2012). They argued that the curriculum should include such learning activities which would begin to open student eyes to more stories and experiences. This is in line with what the students said they also wanted to see included in their education. They wanted more opportunity to research Anzac individual experiences because they felt more empowered with this knowledge and more equipped to critically respond to the other more narrow elements of their Anzac education.

Unassessed Educational Units

Unassessed educational units were another factor which encouraged students to more critically engage with Anzac. They were very critical of the pressure that assessed units put on them to engage with only a narrow version of Anzac and they argued that unassessed educational units, on the other hand, often encouraged a more complex, creative engagement with Anzac.

Students found that the NCEA units they were doing on Anzac often only allowed for engagement with a very narrow version of Anzac. They felt that there was pressure to regurgitate this narrow version of Anzac because this was how they would achieve a high mark. For example, a male from S4 (state, boys) argued that "at high school they teach you narrow stuff needed for assessment, not much more complex detail, but this is what we have to engage with to do well in NCEA." This was frustrating the students because they felt that their drive to get a high mark in assessments often

shut down engagement with and appreciation of Anzac because they were only engaging with a narrow version in the classroom. A female from S6 (private, girls) outlined the way in which their education around Anzac would often become more about the mark rather than engagement with the Anzac reality:

S6 female - Perhaps there is something wrong in how we are educating Anzac by putting a grade on it and asking for a regurgitation of the same old narrow story. When you put a grade on it in NCEA you are learning about the war in a narrow way and you aren't appreciating it. I personally appreciate history but others might be thinking this is all about my mark not actually about what happened and more perspectives. It doesn't often feel realistic in the classroom context because you are learning about it for the sake of getting good grades not learning about it for the sake that you want to and you want to understand it. I feel like if we are going to learn about it and if we are going to increase the appreciation of the youth approach to it then we need to not approach it as needing to be graded but something that you should understand and appreciate and want to learn about it and this can happen when you take a grade away and change up the normal story and present different stuff.

This student wanted to both engage with Anzac in more detail and also achieve high marks in NCEA but she felt this combination was not allowed for in her education. She was frustrated that her education around Anzac was setting up an environment where striving for high marks was at the expense of a deeper critical engagement with Anzac.

The students' solution to this predicament was unassessed educational units. Such units were highlighted as being in the minority in the current education system but those students who had experienced them emphasised their success in allowing deeper critical engagement with Anzac. For example, another female from S6 (private, girls) outlined:

S6 female - I was part of a theatre play which was about the Anzac nurses and this probably taught me more than any other thing at school, like it wasn't assessed so we weren't worried about getting

excellence and could just like listen and learn at our own pace. It wasn't the usual assessment about the male solider. We really had time to appreciate the nurses and become interested and connected.

This example shows the potential these unassessed units could have in allowing a more varied and critical engagement with Anzac. Other students highlighted similar things such as speeches, poster making and essays and they all enjoyed them because they were unassessed and separate from what they argued was the normal, narrow NCEA unit. These units were often more creative and allowed a look at different perspectives within the Anzac reality. The students felt that this learning gave them a better grasp of the Anzac experience and made them feel more confident when it came to critiquing the narrow and mythic elements of their Anzac education which occurred on a much more regular basis.

These unassessed units were few and far between due to the dominance of the Anzac myth and its emphasis on the same narrow version of Anzac as presented in Chapter 3. As Lake & Reynolds (2010) argued, perhaps teachers needed educating as well as students. Indeed, in New Zealand, perhaps the teachers were not aware that they were reinforcing mythic ideas of Anzac in the classroom by providing educational units which only allowed for a narrow understanding of the Anzac reality. Obviously some teachers have seen the importance of providing varied educational opportunities such as these unassessed units but, as the students argued, they are very much in the minority. The students argued that teachers needed to be made aware that their teaching methods and materials were causing students to become disengaged with Anzac. They wanted more teachers to be introduced to different ways of teaching Anzac, ways which were different to the norm such as these unassessed units or, perhaps, affective learning activities such as those outlined above by Harcourt & Sheehan (2012). The students wanted to see more of this kind of learning because they felt it empowered them to view and engage with Anzac more critically, however it was just not occurring now as much as they would have liked.

Centenary Discussions

Interestingly, the students highlighted that the centenary anniversaries of the 2015 Anzac landing in Gallipoli and the 2016 centenary of the first Anzac Day commemoration in New Zealand sparked some interesting discussion around Anzac. These discussions were different from the mythic discussions they were used to under NCEA units in the classroom. They outlined that these anniversaries sparked the telling of some narratives which were different to the mythic discourse they were used to in the classroom. For example, they said they started to hear about the roles of different groups such as Māori activist groups; peace protest groups; and female home-front groups, such as the Women's Patriotic Association, Dominion Stocking League and the Dominion Parcels Scheme. The centenary brought different Anzac experiences to the forefront, which was different to the experiences of the white, military male which they were used to hearing about.

These different groups were celebrating milestones and commemorating their role during the Anzac period, which was often not included in the dominant myth. The students found these discussions and acknowledgement of different experiences helpful to gaining a better understanding of the Anzac reality. A group of male students from S5 (private, boys) outlined this change:

S5 male - Because of the 100-year anniversary there have been more class discussions about different groups who have put stuff in newspapers but who we didn't even know about.

S5 male - It like kind of brought to light more things to think about than the usual.

S5 male -There has been a lot more air time on TV since the centenary for different voices than what we usually hear which was cool actually.

S5 male - Yeah like there were way more experiences and voices than the usual soldier ones.

These centenary discussions around different Anzac experiences gave the students a broader knowledge of the Anzac reality than what they were used to learning about. They used this

knowledge to critique the Anzac myth and often presented to me comparisons between information they were being provided with during this centenary period and the narrower information they were used to hearing during their 'usual' Anzac education. These discussions enhanced student engagement with Anzac by providing them with more perspectives and information to use to challenge their limited classroom experiences.

This increased engagement with centenary discussions and perspectives was what I believe prompted the media claim of resurgence in youth engagement with Anzac, as outlined in Chapter 1. During this centenary period the students outlined that they wanted to thoroughly engage with these different perspectives and group stories because it was different information to what they were used to hearing within the Anzac myth. However, I do not believe this engagement justified an overall claim of resurgence in youth engagement with Anzac as was being speculated in the media. The students were already engaged with Anzac, as is shown in how they were pushing against the myth and critically engaging with their education. Their involvement in centenary commemorations was an extension of this critical engagement, not a resurgence of interest. For example, a female from S3 (state, co-ed) outlined that "there was the centenary, and that drew more attention from us 'cause of new information but after that year it did go back down to normal again, like back to our normal discussion." Similarly, a female student from S6 (private, girls) outlined that "there was a small surge during the 100 year anniversary, like more stuff was being talked about but then it went back to our usual level of chat about Anzac." A male student from S5 (private, boys) agreed in saying that "the 100-year-on may have spiked a surge in our interest and attendance of Anzac events but like it went back down again." Finally, as Robinson (2010, as cited in McKay, 2013) argued, it is 'not just a matter of attendance' but 'a question of attitude' and I believe this attitude or engagement with Anzac was already present and, therefore, a claim of resurgence was unjustified.

An Understanding of Hardship through the Earthquakes

I will now highlight another factor which I saw as enhancing student engagement with Anzac in Christchurch itself. The 2011 Christchurch earthquakes were an event which most of the students I talked to had experienced. Many had been deeply affected by them and had seen destruction, loss and sadness. Students said that the earthquakes installed in them an understanding of hardship and loss which, they felt, helped them to better understand the Anzac reality. They argued that their experiences of hardship made it easier for them to relate to what they were learning about, in terms of the feelings of hardship felt during the Anzac period. For example, a female student from S6 (private, girls) said: "I think about the importance of New Zealand events more now, like Anzac feels more relevant and easier to relate to." The students felt like they now had a better understanding of how a national disaster, whether it be war or a natural disaster, could affect a community.

They felt that this understanding of community loss made Anzac more relevant and easier for them to engage with. For example, a group of male students from S4 (state, boys) also presented this link between the earthquakes and Anzac:

S4 male -The heroic side is there, people looking after others in the earthquakes and it being hard like for the Anzacs.

S4 Māori male - I agree, when you are in trouble someone is there to help out like it helped me understand what it might have been like to be in Anzac shoes.

S4 male - Look at Christchurch, all types of everyday people were there digging rubble and helping people just like all sorts of people helped during Anzac.

Similarly, a female student from S7 (state, co-ed) outlined: "I think people think about Anzac a lot more when it comes around, they now know what it feels like to feel loss but like on a community level." A female student from S3 (state, co-ed) agreed in saying: "The way we think about Anzac

might have changed, it was like a modern day Anzac because heaps of different people were involved and struggled and gave up their time just like the Anzacs." The students drew parallels between the earthquakes and Anzac and felt like their engagement with Anzac was strengthened after having experienced suffering at a community level. They were able to see different people helping in different ways and some students told me this actually made them more aware of the importance of different roles and perspectives. They said they saw not only the 'male emergency services' helping but also groups of people contributing in different ways, such as women's groups making clothes or groups collecting food to distribute. They felt like it encouraged them to look at Anzac differently and acknowledge different groups and experiences because they had seen for themselves the ways that smaller or, perhaps, lesser well-known groups could contribute. Their experience of the 2011 Christchurch earthquakes gave the students a tool with which to challenge their education on Anzac in the classroom setting.

Alternative Perspectives of the Anzac Experience through Access to the Internet

Access to the internet and broader information about Anzac was another way the students challenged the narrow version of Anzac they were being taught in the classroom. Students found that internet resources and multimedia applications such as Facebook and Snapchat filters, like those outlined in Chapter 1, gave them Anzac material to engage with which often went further than the simple narrative.

The students were seen to seek out and engage with these types of technology because it gave them new perspectives and new ways of thinking about Anzac which were different to the ways the Anzac myth was presented in the classroom setting. For example, a male student from S2 (state, co-ed) said: "The myth hasn't influenced us as much and we can challenge it and I think it's because we

have access to the internet now, like, we base our knowledge of the world and have knowledge away from the classroom and can read minority pieces of writing which challenges the norm."

By using the internet, the students said they were able to get a broader understanding of the Anzac experience than what was being taught to them in the classroom setting. A male student from S4 (state, boys) argued this point in saying: "We aren't complacent with what we are told about Anzac, we use technology to ask different kinds of questions and this helps further understanding." A female student from S7 (state, co-ed) agreed in saying: "Technology gives us different opinions and knowledge." They were seen to be active agents in their own Anzac education by seeking out further perspectives and materials, separate from what they were being offered in the classroom.

Lake & Reynolds (2010) similarly outlined the influence multimedia can have on youth engagement with Anzac. They argued that innovative technology can be used to present wartime history through multimedia in ways which are more accessible and understandable to younger Australians. The students I talked to were seen to take it a step further than this by not necessarily seeking out information they could better understand but information which would present to them different perspectives and different ways of thinking about Anzac. As a male from S5 (private, boys) outlined: "Social media and internet articles are on a platform which everyone is aware of and enjoys engaging with, so it is easy to become more clued up about Anzac." They were not passive agents who accepted their mythic education as truth, instead they were seen to actively seek out alternative readings of Anzac via social media platforms and internet articles.

Summary of Chapter 4

These students had the knowledge and tools to critique the Anzac myth and actively respond to the ways their education was limiting their understanding of Anzac. The knowledge which encouraged

this critical engagement with Anzac came from a combination of ancestral ties to Anzac, research into personal Anzac stories and experiences, unassessed educational units, centenary discussions, an understanding of hardship through the earthquakes and alternative perspectives of the Anzac experience through access to the internet. The students were actively involved in their learning and engagement and could clearly outline what factors would enhance this learning. These factors continue to influence the students to push against the myth and critique elements of their education in the classroom. These factors gave the students tools to be active agents in their own Anzac engagement and education.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

The question of youth engagement with Anzac in a New Zealand or Australian context is not something which can be assumed and commented upon without first speaking to youth directly. My semi-structured focus group interviews in Christchurch show that this encounter is both unique and complex. Most importantly, it was not something which could be solely situated under either the debate arguing for Anzac mythology or the debate arguing for Anzac resurgence. Instead, it was multifaceted and made up of particular ideas and elements. Analysis of their engagement showed that Anzac had become mythologised in the classroom but that students were active agents in responding to this. They were able to critique their Anzac education and highlight what elements they found mythic and narrow and how this affected their engagement. They were able to unpack how elements of the myth distorted their learning and they were able to distance themselves from these elements while still holding an interest in and respect for Anzac as part of New Zealand's history.

Scholarly critiques around Anzac mythology and the New Zealand curriculum suggest that young people lack the tools to participate constructively and critically in conversations about the past because there is a risk they internalise whatever mythic discourse they hear in the classroom and accept it as truth. However, the students in my study were not influenced by the Anzac myth in this way; rather they had constructive and critical conversations about their education and pushed against parts of it which they found to be too narrow or skewed in particular directions based on gender, ethnicity and national identity. They were able to make reasoned judgements about Anzac and were not just passive vessels to be influence by elements of their mythic education.

The resurgence debate was shown to be unjustified and based on merely the idea that youth attendance of Anzac events equates somehow to a resurgence in overall youth engagement with Anzac. I argued that the media debate was based on student participation in centenary celebrations

and discussions but this did not show a resurgence of interest because this interest and engagement was already present. The students were already engaged with Anzac, as was shown in how they were pushing against the myth and critically engaging with their education. This was not a new phenomenon. Their involvement in centenary commemorations was merely an extension of this critical engagement, not a resurgence of interest.

I believe that my research methodology was rigorous and robust but a larger sample size could have resulted in more comparative and conclusive results than those made above. My conclusions were often based on ideas and discussions which I felt answered my research questions the most directly, as thematic analysis requires, but these conclusions did not often include a comprehensive comparison of ideas between different demographics and schools. Some comparisons were developed to an extent, such as those between males and females and how they responded to Anzac being related to national identity, but I believe this kind of comparative analysis could have been taken further. My sample had Māori, New Zealand European, English, male, female, state-school, private school, single sex school, co-ed school, rural schools perspectives, and I made sure to present this, but yet there were never many definitive comparisons to make between them. I believe this was because there were not enough students representing these different perspectives to fairly have made conclusive claims about any one group or another. In future research I would hope to be able to talk to a more diverse group of youth from a much larger sample because I believe key comparisons could be found if only there was more discussion to base an analysis on.

I would hope any such sample could include youth who live outside Christchurch, leave secondary school early, are outside the age and year group bracket I used, are home schooled or have already finished high school to pursue work or tertiary study. These youth could not be included within the scope of this study because of time constraints that were in place but their contribution to discussion around Anzac engagement would be vital to then make more robust conclusions about New Zealand youth engagement with Anzac as a whole.

Furthermore, making conclusions about the New Zealand curriculum and Anzac education in the classroom felt one dimensional in many ways without the inclusion of the perspectives and experiences of teachers. Clarke's (2008) research methodology included discussions with teachers and this information was often used to then prompt different kinds of discussion with students. For example, teachers would outline what teaching methods they thought worked well to present certain historical ideas and students would have a chance to directly respond and make recommendations. I believe including teacher perspectives in future research around youth engagement with Anzac could make youth think more deeply about what they might want to see changed and how teachers could help make this happen.

This would be an important future development because, as my analysis showed, students indeed wanted their classroom experience with Anzac to change in particular ways, based on what they thought would enhance their engagement. When it came to their Anzac education, they wanted the classroom environment to allow and encourage critique and question asking because they felt that deeper engagement with Anzac education could only occur when this was allowed for. They wanted alternative readings of the Anzac experience to occur in classroom discussion rather than engaging with only what they saw was the usual, simple narrative which dulled, rather than piqued, their interest in the Anzac reality. The students wanted to learn about variations of the Anzac experience, such as female, Māori, and pacifist experiences, and they wanted these perspectives to be discussed and explored instead of the usual white, military male ones. They wanted their classroom environment to allow more scope and diversity rather than what they saw was the usual narrow reading of Anzac.

The students were seen to more deeply engage with their Anzac education when personal and/or emotional attachment was fostered. This occurred when the students were allowed time within their education to research ancestral ties to Anzacs and personal stories and experiences. They believed this research gave them more perspectives to consider, again separate from what they

called the usual simplistic narrative, and more of an idea of what the Anzac reality was. They wanted to understand the lives of different people involved in the Anzac experience and they did not want this understanding to be limited to any one 'type' of person.

They often found that assessed NCEA units enforced this limited understanding of Anzac and so they wanted to see varied unassessed educational units. They believed that these encouraged a more complex, creative engagement with Anzac without the pressure of needing to achieve a high mark. They recommended that teachers be made more aware of this so as to provide for them educational units which were varied and allowed a look at different perspectives within the Anzac reality. Allowing engagement with multimedia technology and internet articles in the classroom was a further thing students wanted to see included in their Anzac education. Students outlined that Anzac resources from these means often gave them new perspectives and new ways of thinking about Anzac, different from the resources they were used to engaging with in the classroom.

Just because the students critiqued their Anzac education and had very particular ways they wanted to see it changed, did not mean they were no longer interested in it. Anzac education and engagement was actually something which was important to them and this was why they were so intent on making sure this engagement could occur on a deeper and more critical level. I believe that if the New Zealand curriculum were to take on these student recommendations and really reflect on the mythic elements present, then Anzac traditions and experiences could hold a more lasting and significant place in the memories of young New Zealanders.

Bibliography

Aubusson, K (2015).*Why my generation grew up thinking it was un-Australian to question Anzac.* Retrieved from https://www.smh.com.au/opinion/why-my-generation-grew-up-thinking-it-was-unaustralian-to-question-anzac-20150416-1mmee6.html

Barnes, F (2017). *Anzac: myth and memory*. Retrieved from https://www.newsroom.co.nz/2017/04/24/19939/anzac-myth-and-memory

Barthes, R (1993). *Mythologies*, London: Vintage Books.

Bayer, K (2015). *Prime Minister John Key won't apologise for Gallipoli invasion*. Retrieved from http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=11430815

Bevan-Smith, J (2015). *Gallipoli: remembrance as forgetting*. Retrieved from http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/HL1502/S00138/gallopili-remembrance-as-forgetting-john-bevan-smith.htm

Blackburn, K (2016). *War, sport and the Anzac tradition*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bogle, A (2016). *Snapchat makes custom filters for Australia's veteran's day*. Retrieved from http://mashable.com/2016/04/25/snapchat-anzac-day-filters/#CA9g8M6omgq4

Braddock, J & Peters, T (2015). *New Zealand's WWI exhibitions falsify history and glorify war for a new generation.* Retrieved from http://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2015/04/22/anzc-a22.html

Braun, V & Clarke, V (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), pp. 77-101.

Brawley, S & Gascoigne, J (2010). Teaching and learning history, professional ethics and social responsibility. *Studies in Western Australian History*, 26(1), pp. 37–50.

Brown, R (2015). *This Anzac Day.* Retrieved from https://publicaddress.net/9816

Callister, S (2007). Stabat Mater Dolorosa: Death, Photography and Collective Mourning. *New Zealand Journal of History* 41(1), pp. 3–26.

Campbell, G (2015). *What's to commemorate?* Retrieved from http://werewolf.co.nz/2015/04/whats-to-commemorate/

Cannet, A (2016). *Christchurch's Bridge of Remembrance ceremony 'all set' to reopen on Anzac Day.* Retrieved from http://www.stuff.co.nz/the-press/business/the-rebuild/79070694/christchurchs-bridge-of-remembrance-ceremony-all-set-to-reopen-on-anzac-day

Carlyon, L (2001). *Gallipoli*. Sydney: Macmillan Press.

Christchurch City Council (2016). *Anzac Day*. Retrieved from http://www.ccc.govt.nz/culture-and-community/events-and-festivals/annual-events/anzac/

Clarke, A (2008). *History's children: History wars in the classroom.* Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.

Clarke, S (2014). *History of the poppy*. Retrieved from https://rsa.org.nz/Remembrance/PoppyDay/HistoryofthePoppy

Crawford, J & McGibbon, I (2007). *New Zealand's Great War: New Zealand, the Allies and the First World War*. Auckland: Exisle Publishing.

Daley, P (2015). *100 years of Anzac: beyond memorials, what have we really learned?* Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/aug/08/100-years-of-anzac-beyond-memorials-what-have-we-really-learned?CMP=share_btn_tw

Damousi, J (1999). *Labour of loss: Mourning, memory and wartime bereavement in Australia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Damousi, J (2010). Why do we get so emotional about Anzac? In Marilyn Lake & Henry Reynolds (Eds.), *What's Wrong with Anzac? The Militarisation of Australian History*, (pp. 94-109), Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.

Davison, G (2003). The habit of commemoration and the revival of Anzac Day. *Australian Cultural History,* 22, pp. 73–82.

Donoghue, J & Tranter, B (2015). The Anzacs: military influences on Australian identity. *Journal of Sociology*, 51(3), pp. 449-463.

Due Theilade, K (2010). *Talking sexualities New Zealand and Danish students' stories about sexual negotiations* (Doctoral thesis, Sociology, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand). Retrieved from https://ir.canterbury.ac.nz/handle/10092/5512

Edwards, B (2015). *Anzac fatigue and dissent.* Retrieved from https://www.nbr.co.nz/opinion/nz-politics-daily-anzac-fatigue-and-dissent

Fulbrook, M (1997). Myth making and national identity. In G, Hosking & G, Schopflin (Eds.), *Myths and Nationhood*, London: Hurst and Company.

Gigliotti, S (2003). Unspeakable Pasts as Limit Events. *Australian Journal of Politics and History*, 49(2), pp.164-181.

Harcourt, B (2014). *New generation takes on Anzac traditions*. Retrieved from http://www.stuff.co.nz/national/last-post-first-light/9977502/New-generation-takes-on-Anzac-traditions

Harcourt, M & Sheehan, M (2012). *History Matters: Teaching and learning history in New Zealand secondary schools in the 21st century.* Wellington: New Zealand Council for Education Research.

Harper, G (2011). *Letters from Gallipoli: New Zealand soldiers write home*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.

Harris, C (2015). *Cancellation of Camp Gallipoli Foundation event leaves veterans' descendants 'gutted'.* Retrieved from https://www.stuff.co.nz/dominion-post/news/wairarapa/67617029/Cancellation-of-Camp-Gallipoli-Foundation-event-leaves-veterans-descendants-gutted

Holbrook, C (2016). Are we brainwashing our children: The place of Anzac in Australian history. *Agora*, 51(4), pp. 16-22.

Hucker, G (2009). "The Great Wave of Enthusiasm": New Zealand reactions to the First World War in August 1914 – A reassessment. *New Zealand Journal of History,* 43(1), pp. 59–75.

Hyde, F & Harman, S (2011). Motives for a secular pilgrimage to the Gallipoli battlefields. *Tourism Management*, 32(6), pp. 1343-1351.

Hyslop, L (2015). *The commercialisation of Anzac Day*. Retrieved from https://www.stuff.co.nz/business/better-business/67792918/The-commercialisation-of-Anzac-Day

Ignatieff, M (1994). *Blood and belonging: Journeys into the New Nationalism*. Great Britain: Vintage.

Inglis, K (2008). *Sacred places: War memorials in the Australian landscape*. Carlton: Melbourne University Publishing.

Jacoby, R (1975). *Social amnesia: a critique of contemporary psychology*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

Jung, C (1960). The significance of constitution and heredity in psychology. In Read, H, Fordham, M & Adler, G (Eds.), *The Collected Works*, New York: Routledge.

Jung, C (1970). *The structure and dynamics of the psyche* (vol.8). New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Keegan, J (1998). *The First World War*. London: Hutchinson.

Kilmister, M, Bennett, J, Ford, M & Debenham, J (2017). Treading on sacred ground? Confronting the Anzac myth in higher education. *History Compass*, 15(8), pp.1-12.

King, M (2003). *The Penguin History of New Zealand*. Auckland: Penguin.

Lake, M (2009). *We must fight free of ANZAC*. Retrieved from http://www.smh.com.au/federal-politics/we-must-fight-free-of-anzac-lest-we-forget-our-other-stories-20090422-afb7.html

Lake, M (2010). How do schoolchildren learn about the spirit of ANZAC? In Marilyn Lake & Henry Reynolds (Eds.), *What's Wrong with Anzac? The Militarisation of Australian History*, (pp.135-156), Sydney: University of New South Wales Press Ltd.

Lake, M & Reynolds, H (2010). *What's wrong with Anzac*? Sydney: University of New South Wales Press Ltd.

Long, J (2016). *Crosses, row on row, marking grim toll.* Retrieved from http://www.stuff.co.nz/nelson-mail/78567953/anzac-ceremonies-continue-to-grow-with-regions-young-people

Maclean C & Phillips, J (1990). *The sorrow and the pride: New Zealand war memorials*. Wellington: GP Books.

Macleod, J (2002). The fall and rise of Anzac Day: 1965 and 1990 compared. *War and Society*, 20(1), pp. 149–168.

Macleod, J (2004). *Reconsidering Gallipoli.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Mann, B (2015). *Conscientious objector to celebrate 100th birthday on Anzac centenary*. Retrieved from https://www.stuff.co.nz/the-press/news/67843178/Conscientious-objector-to-celebrate-100th-birthday-on-Anzac-centenary

McCormack, A (2015). *What are young people saying about disengaging from mainstream secondary schooling in Aotearoa-New Zealand?* (Master's thesis, Sociology, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand). Retrieved from https://ir.canterbury.ac.nz/handle/10092/12234

McDonald, M (2009). *'Lest We Forget': Invoking the Anzac myth and the memory of sacrifice in Australian military intervention.* Paper presented at International Studies Association Convention, New York.

McDonald, M (2010). 'Lest We Forget': The politics of memory and Australian military intervention. *International Political Sociology*, 4(3), pp. 287-302.

McGibbon, I (2001).*New Zealand battlefields and memorials of the Western Front*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McKay, J (2013). A Critique of the Militarization of Australian History and Culture Thesis: The Case of Anzac Battlefield Tourism. *Journal of Multidisciplinary International Studies,* 10(1), pp.1-15.

McKenna, M & Ward, S (2007). 'It was really moving, mate': The Gallipoli Pilgrimage and Sentimental Nationalism in Australia. *Australian Historical Studies*, 38(129), pp.141-151.

McLeod, R (2015). *War was hell and hardship, not guts and glory*. Retrieved from https://www.stuff.co.nz/dominion-post/comment/columnists/67927920/Rosemary-McLeod-War-was-hell-and-hardship-not-guts-and-glory

McQuilton, J (2004). Gallipoli as contested commemorative space. In J. Macleod (Ed.), *Gallipoli: Making history* (pp.150-158), London: Routledge.

Mercury, G (2015). *Anzac Day should not take prime spot on our national calendar.* Retrieved from http://www.themercury.com.au/news/opinion/talking-point-anzac-day-should-not-take-prime-spot-on-our-national-calendar/news-story/b9ac4e5a8529fcfcfc197034d46b454d

Mertens, D (2009). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods.* Los Angeles: Sage Publishing.

Mitchell, C (2016). *Thousands stand silently in Christchurch for Anzac service.* Retrieved from http://www.stuff.co.nz/the-press/news/79276329/thousands-stand-silently-in-christchurch-for-anzac-service

Moon, Paul (2015). *No Anzac Parade for lifelong stigma of 'conchies'*. Retrieved from http://www.nzherald.co.nz/opinion/news/article.cfm?c_id=466&objectid=11436848

New Zealand Ministry for Culture and Heritage (2014). *Māori and the First World War*. Retrieved from http://www.nzhistory.net.nz/war/maori-in-first-world-war/introduction

New Zealand Ministry for Culture and Heritage (2015). *Modern Anzac Day*. Retrieved from https://nzhistory.govt.nz/war/modern-anzac-day

New Zealand Ministry of Education (2016). *Commemorating World War I for ECE Services and Kōhanga Reo.* Retrieved from https://education.govt.nz/ministry-of-education/events-and-awards/centenary-of-world-war-i-learn-and-never-forget/commemorating-wwi-for-ece-services/

New Zealand Ministry for Culture and Heritage (2017). *Classroom ideas for Anzac Day*. Retrieved from https://nzhistory.govt.nz/war/anzac-day/classroom-activities-anzac-day

New Zealand Ministry for Culture and Heritage (2017). *Māori in the NZEF*. Retrieved from https://nzhistory.govt.nz/war/maori-units-nzef

New Zealand Ministry for Culture and Heritage (2017). *Use of the word 'Anzac' guidelines*. Retrieved from https://mch.govt.nz/nz-identity-heritage/anzac-day/anzac-guidelines

New Zealand Ministry of Youth Development (2014). *Definition of youth*. Retrieved from http://www.youthpolicy.org/factsheets/country/new-zealand/

New Zealand Returned Services Association (2017). *Anzac Day: History*. Retrieved from http://rsa.org.nz/Remembrance/Anzac-Day/History

O'Malley, V (2015). *Historical amnesia over New Zealand's own wars*. Retrieved from https://www.stuff.co.nz/dominion-post/comment/67944795/Historical-amnesia-over-New-Zealands-own-wars

Overing, J (1997). The role of myth. In G, Hosking & G, Schopflin (Eds.), *Myths and Nationhood*, London: Hurst and Company.

Pacella, J (2011). Crikey, it's commodified! An investigation into Anzac Day: The next Nike? *Social Alternatives*, 30(2), pp. 26-29.

Panneerselvam, S. (1999). Myths as discourse in the structural hermeneutics of Levi-Strauss. *Indian Philosophical Quarterly*, 26(1), pp.19-28.

Paulin, A (2015). *On the brink of WWI overload*. Retrieved from https://www.stuff.co.nz/nelson-mail/opinion/67679161/on-the-brink-of-wwi-overload

Peters, T (2015). *New Zealanders shun Camp Gallipoli WWI celebration*. Retrieved from http://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2015/04/10/gall-a10.html

Price, J (2015). *How I fell for Anzac Day, and why I'm over it*. Retrieved from https://www.theage.com.au/opinion/how-i-fell-for-anzac-day-and-why-im-over-it-20150420-1moq2o.html

Pryor, R (2009). *Gallipoli*. Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.

Pugsley, C (1998). *Gallipoli: The New Zealand story*. Auckland: Reed.

Rabel, R (2009). New Zealand's war. In Giselle Byrnes (Ed.), *The New Oxford History of New Zealand* (pp. 245–67), Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Reynolds, H (2010). Are Nations Really Made in War? In Marilyn Lake & Henry Reynolds (Eds.), *What's Wrong with Anzac? The Militarisation of Australian History*, (pp. 28-30), Sydney: University of New South Wales Press Ltd.

Reynolds, H & Lake, M (2010). Introduction. In Marilyn Lake & Henry Reynolds (Eds.), *What's Wrong with Anzac? The Militarisation of Australian History* (pp. 1-23), Sydney: University of New South Wales Press Ltd.

Reynolds, H & Lake, M (2010). Moving On? In Marilyn Lake & Henry Reynolds (Eds.), *What's Wrong with Anzac? The Militarisation of Australian History*, (pp. 156-67), Sydney: University of New South Wales Press Ltd.

Robinson, H (2010). Lest We Forget? The fading of New Zealand war commemorations, 1946–1966. *New Zealand Journal of History*, 44(1), pp.76-91.

Rodgers, S (2015). *The decontextualisation of ANZAC Day*. Retrieved from https://thestandard.org.nz/the-decontextualisation-of-anzac-day/

Scates, B (2006). *Return to Gallipoli: walking the battlefields of the Great War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schopflin, G (1997). The functions of myth and taxonomy of myths. In G, Hosking & G, Schopflin (Eds.), *Myths and Nationhood*, (pp. 19-35), London: Hurst and Company.

Sheehan, M (2011). 'Historical significance' in the senior secondary school curriculum. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 46(2), pp. 35-46.

Sheehan, M (2015). *The ANZAC spirit and 'common values': A talk by Mark Sheehan*. Retrieved from https://www.victoria.ac.nz/education/about/events/past-events-archived/the-anzac-spirit-and-common-values-a-talk-by-mark-sheehan

Sheehan, M (2015). *The role of school history*. Retrieved from https://nzhistory.govt.nz/classroom/the-classroom/teachers-toolbox/the-role-of-school-history

Slade, P (2003). Gallipoli thanatourism: The meaning of Anzac. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30(4), pp. 779–794.

Smith, A (1997). The 'golden age' and national renewal. In G, Hosking & G, Schopflin (Eds.), *Myths and Nationhood*, (pp.36-59), London: Hurst and Company.

Sparrow, J (2012). *Memory and the anti-politics of ANZAC.* Retrieved from https://overland.org.au/2012/04/anzac-day-celebrates-forgetting/

Student Volunteer Army (2016). *Serve for New Zealand*. Retrieved from http://servefor.nz/

Symes, E (2017). *Raglan's younger generation helps Anzac tradition flourish.* Retrieved from http://www.raglanchronicle.co.nz/community/2017/04/1324

Thomson, A (1994). *ANZAC memories*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

West, B (2005). *Independent travel and civil religious pilgrimage: backpackers at the Gallipoli battlefields*. Australia: API Press.

Worthy, S (2002). A debt of honour: New Zealanders' first Anzac Days. *New Zealand Journal of History,* 36, pp. 185–200.